## Page Tables Revisited



Figure 8.3 Address Translation in a Paging System
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## Two-level Translation



## R3000 TLB Refill

- Can be optimised for TLB refill only
- Does not need to check the exception type
- Does not need to save any registers
- It uses a specialised assembly routine that only uses k0 and k1.
- Does not check if PTE exists
- Assumes virtual linear array see extended OS notes
- With careful data structure choice, exception handler can be made very fast
- An example routine
mfcO k1,CO_CONTEXT
mfcO kO,CO_EPC \# mfcO delay
\# slot
1w k1,0(k1) \# may double
\# fault (k0 = orig EPC)
nop
mtcO k1,CO_ENTRYLO
nop
tlbwr
jr k0
rfe


## Virtual Linear Array page table

- Assume a 2-level PT
- Assume $2^{\text {nd }}$-level PT nodes are in virtual memory
 $2^{\text {nd }}$-level nodes form a contiguous array indexed by page number



## Virtual Linear Array Operation



- Index into 2nd level page table without referring to root PT!
- Simply use the full page number as the PT index!
- Leave unused parts of PT unmapped!
- If access is attempted to unmapped part of PT, a secondary page fault is triggered
- This will load the mapping for the PT from the root PT
- Root PT is kept in physical memory (cannot trigger page faults)


## Virtual Linear Array Page Table

- Use Context register to simply load PTE by indexing a PTE array in virtual memory
- Occasionally, will get double faults
- A TLB miss, while servicing a TLB miss
- Handled by general exception handler


> PTEbase in virtual memory in kseg2
> - Protected from user access

## c0 Context Register

- c0_Context = PTEBase + 4 * PageNumber
- PTEs are 4 bytes
- PTEBase is the base local of the page table array (note: aligned on 4 MB boundary)
- PTEBase is (re)initialised by the OS whenever the page table array is changed
- E.g on a context switch
- After an exception, c0_Context contains the address of the PTE required to refill the TLB.


## Code for VLA TLB refill handler



## Software-loaded TLB

- Pros
- Can simplify hardware design
- provide greater flexibility in page table structure
- Cons
- typically have slower refill times than hardware managed TLBs.


## Trends

- Operating systems
- moving functionality into user processes
- making greater use of virtual memory for mapping data structures held within the kernel.
- RAM is increasing
- TLB capacity is relatively static
- Statement:
- Trends place greater stress upon the TLB by increasing miss rates and hence, decreasing overall system performance.
- True/False? How to evaluate?


# Design Tradeoffs for Software-Managed TLBs 

David Nagle, Richard Uhlig, Tim Stanley, Stuart Sechrest Trevor Mudge \& Richard Brown

Software Trap on TLB Miss


## Figure 1: Tapeworm

The Tapeworm TLB simulator is buill into the operating system and is invoked whenever there is a real TLB miss. The simulator uses the real TLB misses to simulate lis own TLB configuration(s). Because the simulator resides in the operating system, Tapeworm captures the dynamic nature of the system and avoids the problems associated with simulators diven by static traces.


| TLB Miss Type | Ultrix | OSF/1 | Mach 3.0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1U | 16 | 20 | 20 |
| L1K | 333 | 355 | 294 |
| L2 | 494 | 511 | 407 |
| L3 | - | 354 | 286 |
| Modity | 375 | 436 | 499 |
| Invalid | 336 | 277 | 267 |

## Table 3: Costs for Different TLB Miss Types

Thid table shows the number of machine cycles (at 60 na/cycle) required to service different types of TLB misses. To determine these costs; Monster was used to collect a 120 K -entry histogram of timings for each type of miss. We separate TLB miss types into the sbx categorles described below. Note that Ulitx does not have L3 misses because I Implements a 2-level page table.
L1U TLB miss on a level 1 user PTE.

L1K
$L 2$

43 TLB miss on a level 3 PTE. Can occur after elther a loyed 2 mbse or a level 1 loemel miss.
TLB mise on a level 1 komel PTE.
TLB muss on lovel 2 PTE. This can only occur after a mises on a level 1 user PTE. A page protection violation.
An access to an page marked as invalld (page tauli).

## Note the TLB miss costs

- What is expected to be the common case?


File system, networking, scheduling and Unbx interface reside Inside a monolithic kernel. Kernel text resides in unmapped space. Ulirix places most kernel data structures in unmapped space while OSF/1 uses mapped space for many of its kernel data structures.


## Mach3.2

File system, networking, and Unlx interface reside Inside the monolithic Unbx Server. Kernel text and some data reside in unmapped virtual space but the Unlx Server is in mapped user space.


Mach3.0 + AFSout
Same as standard Mach 3.0, but with increased functionality provided by a server task. The AFS Cache Manager is elther inside the Unlx Server or in its own, user-level server (as plctured above).

## Measurement Resuits

| System | Total Run Time <br> (eoc) | LIU | LIK | L2 | L3 | Invalid | Modify | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| UltrixX | 583 | $9,021,420$ | 135,847 | 3,828 |  |  | 16,191 | 115 |
| OSF/1 | 892 | $9,817,502$ | $1,509,973$ | 34,972 | 207,163 | 79,299 | 42,490 | $11,691,398$ |
| Mach3 | 975 | $21,466,165$ | $1,682,722$ | 352,713 | 556,264 | 165,849 | 125,409 | $24,349,121$ |
| Mach3+AFSin | 1,371 | $30,123,212$ | $2,493,283$ | 330,803 | 690,441 | 168,429 | 127,245 | $33,933,413$ |
| Mach3+AFSOut | 1,517 | $31,611,047$ | $2,712,979$ | $1,042,527$ | 987,648 | 168,128 | 127,505 | $36,649,834$ |

Table 5: Number of TLB Misses

| System | Total TLB <br> Service Time <br> (sec) | L1U | L1K | L.2 | L3 | Invalid | Modify | \% of Total <br> Run Time |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ultrix | 11.82 | 8.66 | 2.71 | 0.11 | - | 0.33 | 0.00 | $2.03 \%$ |
| OSF/1 | 51.85 | 11.78 | 32.16 | 1.07 | 4.40 | 1.32 | 1.11 | $5.81 \%$ |
| Mach3 | 80.01 | 25.76 | 29.68 | 8.61 | 9.55 | 2.66 | 3.75 | $8.21 \%$ |
| Mach3+AFSin | 106.56 | 36.15 | 43.98 | 8.08 | 11.85 | 2.70 | 3.81 | $7.77 \%$ |
| Mach3+AFSOut | 134.71 | 37.93 | 47.86 | 25.46 | 16.95 | 2.69 | 3.82 | $8.88 \%$ |

Table 6: Time Spent Handling TLB Misses
These tables show the number of TLB misses and amount of time spent handling TLB misses for each of the operating systems studled. In Ultitx, most of the TLB misses and TLB miss time is spent servicing L1U TLB misses. However, for OSF/1 and various versions of Mach 3.0, L1K and L2 misses can overshadow the LIU miss time. The increase in Modily misses is due to OSF/1 and Mach 3.0's use of protection to implement copy-on-write memory sharing.

## Specialising the L2/L1K miss vector

| Type of PTE <br> Miss | Counts | Previous <br> Total <br> Cost <br> from <br> Table 6 <br> (sec) | New <br> Total <br> Cost <br> (sec) | Time <br> Saved <br> (sec) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Mach3+AFSin |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1U | $30,123,212$ | 36.15 | 36.15 | 0.00 |  |
| L2 | 330,803 | 8.08 | 0.79 | 7.29 |  |
| L1K | $2,493,283$ | 43.98 | 2.99 | 40.99 |  |
| L3 | 690,441 | 11.85 | 11.85 | 0.00 |  |
| Modify | 127,245 | 3.81 | 3.81 | 0.00 |  |
| Invalld | 168,429 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 0.00 |  |
| Total | $33,933,413$ | 106.56 | 58.29 | 48.28 |  |

Table 7: Recomputed Cost of TLB Misses Given Additional Miss Vectors (Mach 3.0)

Supplying a separate interrupt vector for 22 misses and allowing the UTLB handier to service L1K misses reduces their cost to 40 and 20 cycles, respectively. Their contribution to TLB miss time drops from 8.08 and 43.98 seconds down to 0.79 and 2.99 seconds, respectively.

## Other performance improvements?

- In Paper
- Pinned slots
- Increased TLB size
- TLB associativity
- Other options
- Bigger page sizes
- Multiple page sizes


## Itanium Page Table

- Takes a bet each way
- Loading
- software
- two different format hardware walkers
- Page table
- software defined
- linear
- hashed


