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Recall: Caching Applied to Address Translation

- Question is one of page locality: does it exist?
  - Instruction accesses spend a lot of time on the same page (since accesses sequential)
  - Stack accesses have definite locality of reference
  - Data accesses have less page locality, but still some…

- Can we have a TLB hierarchy?
  - Sure: multiple levels at different sizes/speeds
Recall: Current x86 (Skylake, Cascade Lake)
Recall: Putting Everything Together: Address Translation

Virtual Address:
- Virtual P1 index
- Virtual P2 index
- Offset

Page Table Pointer

Page Table (1st level)

Virtual Address:
- Virtual P1 index
- Virtual P2 index
- Offset

Page Table (2nd level)

Physical Address:
- Physical Page #
- Offset

Physical Memory:
Recall: Putting Everything Together: TLB

Virtual Address:

Virtual P1 index Virtual P2 index Offset

Page Table (1st level)

Page Table (2nd level)

TLB:

Virtual Page # Offset

Physical Address:

Physical Memory:
Recall: Putting Everything Together: Cache

Virtual Address:

Virtual P1 index Virtual P2 index Offset

Page Table (1st level)

Page Table (2nd level)

Physical Address:

Virtual Page # Offset
tag index byte

cache:

Physical Memory:

TLB:

...
Recall: Page Fault $\Rightarrow$ Demand Paging

Process

virtual address

instruction

exception

page fault

update PT entry

load page from disk

physical address

page#

frame#

offset

frame#

offset

MMU

PT

scheduler

retry

Operating System

Page Fault Handler

Operating System

Page Fault Handler
Demand Paging

- Modern programs require a lot of physical memory
  - Memory per system growing faster than 25%-30%/year
- But they don’t use all their memory all of the time
  - 90-10 rule: programs spend 90% of their time in 10% of their code
  - Wasteful to require all of user’s code to be in memory
- Solution: use main memory as “cache” for disk
Demand Paging as Caching, …

- What “block size”? - 1 page (e.g., 4 KB)
- What “organization” i.e. direct-mapped, set-associ., fully-associative?
  - Any page in any frame of memory, i.e., fully associative: arbitrary virtual → physical mapping
- How do we locate a page?
  - First check TLB, then page-table traversal
- What is page replacement policy? (i.e. LRU, Random…)
  - This requires more explanation… (kinda LRU)
- What happens on a miss?
  - Go to lower level to fill miss (i.e. disk)
- What happens on a write? (write-through, write back)
  - Definitely write-back – need dirty bit!
Illusion of Infinite Memory

- Disk is larger than physical memory ⇒
  - In-use virtual memory can be bigger than physical memory
  - Combined memory of running processes much larger than physical memory
    » More programs fit into memory, allowing more concurrency
- Principle: **Transparent Level of Indirection** (page table)
  - Supports flexible placement of physical data
    » Data could be on disk or somewhere across network
  - Variable location of data transparent to user program
    » Performance issue, not correctness issue
Review: What is in a PTE?

- What is in a Page Table Entry (or PTE)?
  - Pointer to next-level page table or to actual page
  - Permission bits: valid, read-only, read-write, write-only

- Example: Intel x86 architecture PTE:
  - 2-level page tabler (10, 10, 12-bit offset)
  - Intermediate page tables called “Directories”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Frame Number (Physical Page Number)</th>
<th>Free (OS)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>PCD</th>
<th>PWT</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-12</td>
<td>11-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P: Present (same as “valid” bit in other architectures)
W: Writeable
U: User accessible
PWT: Page write transparent: external cache write-through
PCD: Page cache disabled (page cannot be cached)
A: Accessed: page has been accessed recently
D: Dirty (PTE only): page has been modified recently
PS: Page Size: PS=1 ⇒ 4MB page (directory only). Bottom 22 bits of virtual address serve as offset
Demand Paging Mechanisms

• PTE makes demand paging implementable
  – Valid ⇒ Page in memory, PTE points at physical page
  – Not Valid ⇒ Page not in memory; use info in PTE to find it on disk when necessary

• Suppose user references page with invalid PTE?
  – Memory Management Unit (MMU) traps to OS
    » Resulting trap is a “Page Fault”
  – What does OS do on a Page Fault?:
    » Choose an old page to replace
    » If old page modified (“D=1”), write contents back to disk
    » Change its PTE and any cached TLB to be invalid
    » Load new page into memory from disk
    » Update page table entry, invalidate TLB for new entry
    » Continue thread from original faulting location
  – TLB for new page will be loaded when thread continued!
  – While pulling pages off disk for one process, OS runs another process from ready queue
    » Suspended process sits on wait queue
Origins of Paging

Disks provide most of the storage

Actively swap pages to/from

Keep memory full of the frequently accesses pages

Keep most of the address space on disk

Relatively small memory, for many processes

Many clients on dumb terminals running different programs
Very Different Situation Today

Powerful system
Huge memory
Huge disk
Single user
A Picture on one machine

- Memory stays about 75% used, 25% for dynamics
- A lot of it is shared 1.9 GB
Many Uses of Virtual Memory and “Demand Paging” …

• Extend the stack
  – Allocate a page and zero it

• Extend the heap (sbrk of old, today mmap)

• Process Fork
  – Create a copy of the page table
  – Entries refer to parent pages – NO-WRITE
  – Shared read-only pages remain shared
  – Copy page on write

• Exec
  – Only bring in parts of the binary in active use
  – Do this on demand

• MMAP to explicitly share region (or to access a file as RAM)
Classic: Loading an executable into memory

- .exe
  - lives on disk in the file system
  - contains contents of code & data segments, relocation entries and symbols
  - OS loads it into memory, initializes registers (and initial stack pointer)
  - program sets up stack and heap upon initialization:
    - `crt0` (C runtime init)
Create Virtual Address Space of the Process

- Utilized pages in the VAS are backed by a page block on disk
  - Called the backing store or swap file
  - Typically in an optimized block store, but can think of it like a file
Create Virtual Address Space of the Process

- User Page table maps entire VAS
- All the utilized regions are backed on disk
  - swapped into and out of memory as needed
- For every process
Create Virtual Address Space of the Process

- User Page table maps entire VAS
  - Resident pages to the frame in memory they occupy
  - The portion of it that the HW needs to access must be resident in memory
Provide Backing Store for VAS

- User Page table maps entire VAS
- Resident pages mapped to memory frames
- For all other pages, OS must record where to find them on disk
What Data Structure Maps Non-Resident Pages to Disk?

- **FindBlock**(PID, page#) → disk_block
  - Some OSs utilize spare space in PTE for paged blocks
  - Like the PT, but purely software

- Where to store it?
  - In memory – can be compact representation if swap storage is contiguous on disk
  - Could use hash table (like Inverted PT)

- Usually want backing store for resident pages too

- May map code segment directly to on-disk image
  - Saves a copy of code to swap file

- May share code segment with multiple instances of the program
Provide Backing Store for VAS

disk (huge, TB)

- stack
- heap
- data
- code

VAS 1
- kernel
- stack
- heap
- data
- code

VAS 2
- kernel
- stack
- heap
- data
- code

PT 1
- memory
  - user
  - page frames
  - user pagetable
  - kernel code & data

PT 2
On page Fault …
On page Fault … find & start load
On page Fault ... schedule other P or T
On page Fault … update PTE
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Eventually reschedule faulting thread

disk (huge, TB)

stack

heap

data

code

heap

data

code

VAS 1

stack

heap

data

code

VAS 2

stack

heap

data

code

PT 1

memory

user page frames

user pagetable

kernel code & data

active process & PT
Summary: Steps in Handling a Page Fault

1. Trap
2. Page is on backing store
3. Operating system
4. Bring in missing page
5. Reset page table
6. Restart instruction

load M

Page Table

Free Frame

Physical Memory
Some questions we need to answer!

• During a page fault, where does the OS get a free frame?
  – Keeps a free list
  – Unix runs a “reaper” if memory gets too full
    » Schedule dirty pages to be written back on disk
    » Zero (clean) pages which haven’t been accessed in a while
  – As a last resort, evict a dirty page first

• How can we organize these mechanisms?
  – Work on the replacement policy

• How many page frames/process?
  – Like thread scheduling, need to “schedule” memory resources:
    » Utilization? fairness? priority?
  – Allocation of disk paging bandwidth
Working Set Model

- As a program executes it transitions through a sequence of “working sets” consisting of varying sized subsets of the address space.
Cache Behavior under WS model

- Amortized by fraction of time the Working Set is active
- Transitions from one WS to the next
- Capacity, Conflict, Compulsory misses
- Applicable to memory caches and pages.

Hit Rate vs. Cache Size

- New working set fits
Another model of Locality: Zipf

\[ P(\text{access}(\text{rank})) = \frac{1}{\text{rank}} \]

- Likelihood of accessing item of rank \( r \) is \( \alpha \frac{1}{r^a} \)
- Although rare to access items below the top few, there are so many that it yields a “heavy tailed” distribution
- Substantial value from even a tiny cache
- Substantial misses from even a very large cache

### Estimated Hit Rate vs. Popularity (% accesses)

- **Pop a=1**
- **Hit Rate (cache)**
Demand Paging Cost Model

• Since Demand Paging like caching, can compute average access time! ("Effective Access Time")
  – \( EAT = \text{Hit Rate} \times \text{Hit Time} + \text{Miss Rate} \times \text{Miss Time} \)
  – \( EAT = \text{Hit Time} + \text{Miss Rate} \times \text{Miss Penalty} \)

• Example:
  – Memory access time = 200 nanoseconds
  – Average page-fault service time = 8 milliseconds
  – Suppose \( p = \text{Probability of miss}, \ 1-p = \text{Probably of hit} \)
  – Then, we can compute \( EAT \) as follows:
    \[
    EAT = 200\text{ns} + p \times 8 \text{ ms}
    = 200\text{ns} + p \times 8,000,000\text{ns}
    \]

• If one access out of 1,000 causes a page fault, then \( EAT = 8.2 \mu s \):
  – This is a slowdown by a factor of 40!

• What if want slowdown by less than 10%?
  – \( EAT < 200\text{ns} \times 1.1 \Rightarrow p < 2.5 \times 10^{-6} \)
  – This is about 1 page fault in 400,000!
What Factors Lead to Misses in Page Cache?

- **Compulsory Misses:**
  - Pages that have never been paged into memory before
  - How might we remove these misses?
    - Prefetching: loading them into memory before needed
    - Need to predict future somehow! More later

- **Capacity Misses:**
  - Not enough memory. Must somehow increase available memory size.
  - Can we do this?
    - One option: Increase amount of DRAM (not quick fix!)
    - Another option: If multiple processes in memory: adjust percentage of memory allocated to each one!

- **Conflict Misses:**
  - Technically, conflict misses don’t exist in virtual memory, since it is a “fully-associative” cache

- **Policy Misses:**
  - Caused when pages were in memory, but kicked out prematurely because of the replacement policy
  - How to fix? Better replacement policy
Page Replacement Policies

• Why do we care about Replacement Policy?
  – Replacement is an issue with any cache
  – Particularly important with pages
    » The cost of being wrong is high: must go to disk
    » Must keep important pages in memory, not toss them out

• FIFO (First In, First Out)
  – Throw out oldest page. Be fair – let every page live in memory for same amount of time.
  – Bad – throws out heavily used pages instead of infrequently used

• RANDOM:
  – Pick random page for every replacement
  – Typical solution for TLB’s. Simple hardware
  – Pretty unpredictable – makes it hard to make real-time guarantees

• MIN (Minimum):
  – Replace page that won’t be used for the longest time
  – Great (provably optimal), but can’t really know future…
  – But past is a good predictor of the future …
Replacement Policies (Con’t)

• LRU (Least Recently Used):
  – Replace page that hasn’t been used for the longest time
  – Programs have locality, so if something not used for a while, unlikely to be used in the near future.
  – Seems like LRU should be a good approximation to MIN.

• How to implement LRU? Use a list!
  – On each use, remove page from list and place at head
  – LRU page is at tail

• Problems with this scheme for paging?
  – Need to know immediately when each page used so that can change position in list…
  – Many instructions for each hardware access

• In practice, people approximate LRU (more later)
Example: FIFO (strawman)

• Suppose we have 3 page frames, 4 virtual pages, and following reference stream:
  – A B C A B D A D B C B

• Consider FIFO Page replacement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Page</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• FIFO: 7 faults
• When referencing D, replacing A is bad choice, since need A again right away
• Suppose we have the same reference stream:
  – A B C A B D A D B C B

• Consider MIN Page replacement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Ref:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• MIN: 5 faults
  – Where will D be brought in? Look for page not referenced farthest in future

• What will LRU do?
  – Same decisions as MIN here, but won’t always be true!
Is LRU guaranteed to perform well?

- Consider the following: A B C D A B C D A B C D
- LRU Performs as follows (same as FIFO here):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Every reference is a page fault!
- Fairly contrived example of working set of N+1 on N frames
When will LRU perform badly?

- Consider the following: A B C D A B C D A B C D
- LRU Performs as follows (same as FIFO here):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Every reference is a page fault!

- MIN Does much better:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph of Page Faults Versus The Number of Frames

- One desirable property: When you add memory the miss rate drops
  - Does this always happen?
  - Seems like it should, right?
- No: Bélády’s anomaly
  - Certain replacement algorithms (FIFO) don't have this obvious property!
### Adding Memory Doesn’t Always Help Fault Rate

- **Does adding memory reduce number of page faults?**
  - Yes for LRU and MIN
  - Not necessarily for FIFO! (Called Bélády’s anomaly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Page</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Page</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **After adding memory:**
  - With FIFO, contents can be completely different
  - In contrast, with LRU or MIN, contents of memory with X pages are a subset of contents with X+1 Page
Implementing LRU

• Perfect:
  – Timestamp page on each reference
  – Keep list of pages ordered by time of reference
  – Too expensive to implement in reality for many reasons

• Clock Algorithm: Arrange physical pages in circle with single clock hand
  – Approximate LRU (approximation to approximation to MIN)
  – Replace an old page, not the oldest page

• Details:
  – Hardware “use” bit per physical page:
    » Hardware sets use bit on each reference
    » If use bit isn’t set, means not referenced in a long time
  – On page fault:
    » Advance clock hand (not real time)
    » Check use bit: 1 → used recently; clear and leave alone
                 0 → selected candidate for replacement
  – Will always find a page or loop forever?
    » Even if all use bits set, will eventually loop around ⇒ FIFO
Clock Algorithm: Not Recently Used

Set of all pages in Memory

Single Clock Hand:
Advances only on page fault!
Check for pages not used recently
Mark pages as not used recently

• What if hand moving slowly?
  – Good sign or bad sign?
    » Not many page faults and/or find page quickly

• What if hand is moving quickly?
  – Lots of page faults and/or lots of reference bits set

• One way to view clock algorithm:
  – Crude partitioning of pages into two groups: young and old
  – Why not partition into more than 2 groups?
**N\textsuperscript{th} Chance version of Clock Algorithm**

- **N\textsuperscript{th} chance algorithm:** Give page N chances
  - OS keeps counter per page: # sweeps
  - On page fault, OS checks use bit:
    - 1 → clear use and also clear counter (used in last sweep)
    - 0 → increment counter; if count=N, replace page
  - Means that clock hand has to sweep by N times without page being used before page is replaced

- **How do we pick N?**
  - Why pick large N? Better approximation to LRU
    - If N ~ 1K, really good approximation
  - Why pick small N? More efficient
    - Otherwise might have to look a long way to find free page

- **What about dirty pages?**
  - Takes extra overhead to replace a dirty page, so give dirty pages an extra chance before replacing?
  - Common approach:
    - Clean pages, use N=1
    - Dirty pages, use N=2 (and write back to disk when N=1)
Clock Algorithms: Details

- Which bits of a PTE entry are useful to us?
  - **Use:** Set when page is referenced; cleared by clock algorithm
  - **Modified:** set when page is modified, cleared when page written to disk
  - **Valid:** ok for program to reference this page
  - **Read-only:** ok for program to read page, but not modify
    » For example for catching modifications to code pages!

- Do we really need hardware-supported “modified” bit?
  - No. Can emulate it (BSD Unix) using read-only bit
    » Initially, mark all pages as read-only, even data pages
    » On write, trap to OS. OS sets software “modified” bit, and marks page as read-write.
    » Whenever page comes back in from disk, mark read-only
Clock Algorithms Details (continued)

• Do we really need a hardware-supported “use” bit?
  – No. Can emulate it similar to above:
    » Mark all pages as invalid, even if in memory
    » On read to invalid page, trap to OS
    » OS sets use bit, and marks page read-only
  – Get modified bit in same way as previous:
    » On write, trap to OS (either invalid or read-only)
    » Set use and modified bits, mark page read-write
  – When clock hand passes by, reset use and modified bits and mark page as invalid again

• Remember, however, clock is just an approximation of LRU!
  – Can we do a better approximation, given that we have to take page faults on some reads and writes to collect use information?
  – Need to identify an old page, not oldest page!
  – Answer: second chance list
Second-Chance List Algorithm (VAX/VMS)

- Split memory in two: Active list (RW), SC list (Invalid)
- Access pages in Active list at full speed
- Otherwise, Page Fault
  - Always move overflow page from end of Active list to front of Second-chance list (SC) and mark invalid
  - Desired Page On SC List: move to front of Active list, mark RW
  - Not on SC list: page in to front of Active list, mark RW; page out LRU victim at end of SC list
Second-Chance List Algorithm (continued)

• How many pages for second chance list?
  – If 0 ⇒ FIFO
  – If all ⇒ LRU, but page fault on every page reference

• Pick intermediate value. Result is:
  – Pro: Few disk accesses (page only goes to disk if unused for a long time)
  – Con: Increased overhead trapping to OS (software / hardware tradeoff)

• Question: why didn't VAX include “use” bit?
  – Strecker (architect) asked OS people, they said they didn’t need it, so didn’t implement it
  – He later got blamed, but VAX did OK anyway
Free List

- Keep set of free pages ready for use in demand paging
  - Freelist filled in background by Clock algorithm or other technique ("Pageout demon")
  - Dirty pages start copying back to disk when enter list
- Like VAX second-chance list
  - If page needed before reused, just return to active set
- Advantage: faster for page fault
  - Can always use page (or pages) immediately on fault
Demand Paging (more details)

• Does software-loaded TLB need use bit?
  Two Options:
  – Hardware sets use bit in TLB; when TLB entry is replaced, software copies use bit back to page table
  – Software manages TLB entries as FIFO list; everything not in TLB is Second-Chance list, managed as strict LRU

• Core Map
  – Page tables map virtual page $\mapsto$ physical page
  – Do we need a reverse mapping (i.e. physical page $\mapsto$ virtual page)?
    » Yes. Clock algorithm runs through page frames. If sharing, then multiple virtual-pages per physical page
    » Can’t push page out to disk without invalidating all PTEs
Allocation of Page Frames (Memory Pages)

• How do we allocate memory among different processes?
  – Does every process get the same fraction of memory? Different fractions?
  – Should we completely swap some processes out of memory?

• Each process needs *minimum* number of pages
  – Want to make sure that all processes that are loaded into memory can make forward progress
  – Example: IBM 370 – 6 pages to handle SS MOVE instruction:
    » instruction is 6 bytes, might span 2 pages
    » 2 pages to handle *from*
    » 2 pages to handle *to*

• Possible Replacement Scopes:
  – Global replacement – process selects replacement frame from set of all frames; one process can take a frame from another
  – Local replacement – each process selects from only its own set of allocated frames
Fixed/Priority Allocation

• Equal allocation (Fixed Scheme):
  – Every process gets same amount of memory
  – Example: 100 frames, 5 processes → process gets 20 frames

• Proportional allocation (Fixed Scheme)
  – Allocate according to the size of process
  – Computation proceeds as follows:
    \[ s_i = \text{size of process } p_i \text{ and } S = \sum s_i \]
    \[ m = \text{total number of frames} \]
    \[ a_i = (\text{allocation for } p_i) = \frac{s_i}{S} \times m \]

• Priority Allocation:
  – Proportional scheme using priorities rather than size
    » Same type of computation as previous scheme
  – Possible behavior: If process \( p_i \) generates a page fault, select for replacement a frame from a process with lower priority number

• Perhaps we should use an adaptive scheme instead???
  – What if some application just needs more memory?
Page-Fault Frequency Allocation

• Can we reduce Capacity misses by dynamically changing the number of pages/application?

- Establish “acceptable” page-fault rate
  - If actual rate too low, process loses frame
  - If actual rate too high, process gains frame

• Question: What if we just don’t have enough memory?
Thrashing

• If a process does not have “enough” pages, the page-fault rate is very high. This leads to:
  – low CPU utilization
  – operating system spends most of its time swapping to disk
• Thrashing ≡ a process is busy swapping pages in and out
• Questions:
  – How do we detect Thrashing?
  – What is best response to Thrashing?
Locality In A Memory-Reference Pattern

- Program Memory Access Patterns have temporal and spatial locality
  - Group of Pages accessed along a given time slice called the “Working Set”
  - Working Set defines minimum number of pages needed for process to behave well
- Not enough memory for Working Set $\Rightarrow$ Thrashing
  - Better to swap out process?
Working-Set Model

- $\Delta \equiv$ working-set window $\equiv$ fixed number of page references
  - Example: 10,000 instructions
- $WS_i$ (working set of Process $Pi$) = total set of pages referenced in the most recent $\Delta$ (varies in time)
  - if $\Delta$ too small will not encompass entire locality
  - if $\Delta$ too large will encompass several localities
  - if $\Delta = \infty \Rightarrow$ will encompass entire program
- $D = \sum |WS_i| \equiv$ total demand frames
- if $D > m \Rightarrow$ Thrashing
  - Policy: if $D > m$, then suspend/swap out processes
  - This can improve overall system behavior by a lot!
What about Compulsory Misses?

- Recall that compulsory misses are misses that occur the first time that a page is seen
  - Pages that are touched for the first time
  - Pages that are touched after process is swapped out/swapped back in

- Clustering:
  - On a page-fault, bring in multiple pages “around” the faulting page
  - Since efficiency of disk reads increases with sequential reads, makes sense to read several sequential pages

- Working Set Tracking:
  - Use algorithm to try to track working set of application
  - When swapping process back in, swap in working set
Reverse Page Mapping
(Sometimes called “Coremap”)

• Physical page frames often shared by many different address spaces/page tables
  – All children forked from given process
  – Shared memory pages between processes
• Whatever reverse mapping mechanism that is in place must be very fast
  – Must hunt down all page tables pointing at given page frame when freeing a page
  – Must hunt down all PTEs when seeing if pages “active”
• Implementation options:
  – For every page descriptor, keep linked list of page table entries that point to it
    » Management nightmare – expensive
  – Linux 2.6: Object-based reverse mapping
    » Link together memory region descriptors instead (much coarser granularity)
Linux Memory Details?

• Memory management in Linux considerably more complex than the examples we have been discussing

• Memory Zones: physical memory categories
  – ZONE_DMA: < 16MB memory, DMAable on ISA bus
  – ZONE_NORMAL: 16MB → 896MB (mapped at 0xC0000000)
  – ZONE_HIGHMEM: Everything else (> 896MB)

• Each zone has 1 freelist, 2 LRU lists (Active/Inactive)

• Many different types of allocation
  – SLAB allocators, per-page allocators, mapped/unmapped

• Many different types of allocated memory:
  – Anonymous memory (not backed by a file, heap/stack)
  – Mapped memory (backed by a file)

• Allocation priorities
  – Is blocking allowed/etc
Linux Virtual memory map

32-Bit Virtual Address Space

Kernel Addresses

User Addresses

64-Bit Virtual Address Space

Kernel Addresses

Empty Space

User Addresses

0x00000000
896MB
Physical

0xC0000000
1GB

0x0000000000000000
3GB Total

0x00007FFFFFFF
896MB

0xFFFF800000000000
64 TiB
Physical

“Canonical Hole”

0x0000000000000000
128TiB

0xFFFFFFFF
1GB

3GB Total

0xFFFFFFFFFFFFF
128TiB

0xFFFF800000000000
Virtual Map (Details)

- Kernel memory not generally visible to user
  - Exception: special VDSO (virtual dynamically linked shared objects) facility that maps kernel code into user space to aid in system calls (and to provide certain actual system calls such as `gettimeofday()`)

- Every physical page described by a “page” structure
  - Collected together in lower physical memory
  - Can be accessed in kernel virtual space
  - Linked together in various “LRU” lists

- For 32-bit virtual memory architectures:
  - When physical memory < 896MB
    » All physical memory mapped at 0xC0000000
  - When physical memory >= 896MB
    » Not all physical memory mapped in kernel space all the time
    » Can be temporarily mapped with addresses > 0xCC000000

- For 64-bit virtual memory architectures:
  - All physical memory mapped above 0xFFFF800000000000
Summary

- Replacement policies
  - FIFO: Place pages on queue, replace page at end
  - MIN: Replace page that will be used farthest in future
  - LRU: Replace page used farthest in past
- Clock Algorithm: Approximation to LRU
  - Arrange all pages in circular list
  - Sweep through them, marking as not “in use”
  - If page not “in use” for one pass, than can replace
- N\textsuperscript{th}-chance clock algorithm: Another approximate LRU
  - Give pages multiple passes of clock hand before replacing
- Second-Chance List algorithm: Yet another approximate LRU
  - Divide pages into two groups, one of which is truly LRU and managed on page faults.
- Working Set:
  - Set of pages touched by a process recently
- Thrashing: a process is busy swapping pages in and out
  - Process will thrash if working set doesn't fit in memory
  - Need to swap out a process