

Memory Virtualization:
Beyond Physical Memory

CS 571: Operating Systems (Spring 2022)

Lecture 5

Yue Cheng

Some material taken/derived from:

- Wisconsin CS-537 materials created by Remzi Arpaci-Dusseau.

Today's outline

1. Mechanisms

2. Polices
    1. FIFO
    2. Random
    3. LRU
    4. MIN: Belady's optimal
    5. ARC

3. Misc. (TLB caching)

Beyond Physical Memory: Mechanisms


Disk
code
data
Program
Virtual memory


Disk
code
data
Program
Virtual memory
code
data
heap
stack
Process 1



What's in code?



What's in code?

Many large libraries, some of which are rarely/never used



How to avoid wasting physical pages to back rarely used virtual pages?


Disk
LibA
LibB
LibC
Prog
data
Program
Virtual memory
LibA
LibB
LibC
Prog
data
heap
stack
Process 1
Physical memory
LibC
Prog


Disk
LibA
LibB
LibC
Prog
data
Program
Virtual memory
LibA
LibB
LibC
Prog
data
heap
stack
Process 1
Physical memory
LibC
Prog



Process 1 accesses LibB



OS copies LibB to mem



called "**swapping in**" or "**paging in**"

How to Know Where a Page Lives?

Present Bit

- With each PTE a present is associated
  - 1 ➔ in-memory, 0 ➔ out in disk



- During address translation, if present bit in PTE is 0 ➔ page fault

Present Bit

PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

A page table

Present Bit



PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

Present Bit



PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0 access
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

Present Bit





PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
8	1	rw-	1 access
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

What if NO Memory is Left?

Present Bit



PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

Present Bit



Phys memory

FULL

PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0 access
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

Present Bit





PFN	valid	prot	present
5	1	r-x	1 evict
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0 access
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

Present Bit



PFN	valid	prot	present
63	1	r-x	0
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

evict

access

Present Bit

called "**swapping out**"
or "**paging out**"





PFN	valid	prot	present
63	1	r-x	0 evict
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0 access
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

Present Bit



PFN	valid	prot	present
63	1	r-x	0
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
60	1	rw-	0
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

access

Present Bit





PFN	valid	prot	present
63	1	r-x	0
-	0	-	-
-	0	-	-
5	1	rw-	1
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
-	0	0	-
4	1	rw-	1
64	1	rw-	0

access

again, another "**swapping in**"
or "**paging in**"

Why not Leave Page on Disk?

Why not Leave Page on Disk?

- Performance: Memory vs. Disk

- How long does it take to access a 4-byte `int` from main memory vs. disk?
  - DRAM: ~100ns
  - Disk: ~10ms

Beyond the Physical Memory

- Idea: use the disk space as an extension of main memory

- Two ways of interaction b/w memory and disk
  - Demand paging
  - Swapping

Demand Paging

- Bring a page into memory only when it is needed (demanded)
  - Less I/O needed
  - Less memory needed
  - Faster response
  - Support more processes/users

- Page is needed ⇒ use the reference to page
  - If not in memory ⇒ must bring from the disk

Swapping

- Swapping allows OS to support the illusion of a large virtual memory for multiprogramming
  - Multiple programs can run "at once"
  - Better utilization
  - Ease of use

- Demand paging vs. swapping
  - On demand vs. page replacement under memory pressure

Address Translation Steps

Hardware: for each memory reference:

- Extract VPN from VA
- Check TLB for VPN
- TLB hit:
  - Build PA from PFN and offset
  - Fetch PA from memory
- TLB miss:
  - Fetch PTE
  - if (!valid): exception [segfault]
  - else if (!present): exception [page fault: page miss]
  - else: extract PFN, insert in TLB, retry

Address Translation Steps

Hardware: for each memory reference:

Extract VPN from VA
Check TLB for VPN
TLB hit:
    Build PA from PFN and offset
    Fetch PA from memory
TLB miss:
    Fetch PTE
    if (!valid): exception [segfault]
    else if (!present): exception [page fault: page miss]
    else: extract PFN, insert in TLB, retry

- Q: Which steps are expensive??

Address Translation Steps

Hardware: for each memory reference:

(cheap) Extract VPN from VA
(cheap) Check TLB for VPN
TLB hit:
(cheap) Build PA from PFN and offset
(expensive) Fetch PA from memory
TLB miss:
(expensive) Fetch PTE
(expensive) if (!valid): exception [segfault]
(expensive) else if (!present): exception [page fault: page miss]
(cheap) else: extract PFN, insert in TLB, retry

- Q: Which steps are expensive??

Page Fault

- The act of accessing a page that is not in physical memory is called a page fault
- OS is invoked to service the page fault
  - Page fault handler
- In a canonical example, we assume that PTE contains the page address on disk
  - To avoid getting too deep into the page fault handling process

Simplified: Page-Fault Handler (OS)

```
PFN = FindFreePage()
if (PFN == -1)
        PFN = EvictPage()
DiskRead(PTE.DiskAddr, PFN)
PTE.present = 1
PTE.PFN = PFN
retry instruction
```

Simplified: Page-Fault Handler (OS)

```
PFN = FindFreePage()
if (PFN == -1)
        PFN = EvictPage()
DiskRead(PTE.DiskAddr, PFN)
PTE.present = 1
PTE.PFN = PFN
retry instruction
```

Q: which steps are expensive?

Simplified: Page-Fault Handler (OS)

(cheap) PFN = FindFreePage()

(cheap) if (PFN == -1)

(depends) PFN = EvictPage()

(expensive) DiskRead(PTE.DiskAddr, PFN)

(cheap) PTE.present = 1

(cheap) PTE.PFN = PFN

(cheap) retry instruction

Q: which steps are expensive?

Simplified: Page-Fault Handler (OS)

(cheap) PFN = FindFreePage()

(cheap) if (PFN == -1)

(depends) PFN = EvictPage()

(expensive) DiskRead(PTE.DiskAddr, PFN)

What to evict?

What to read?

(cheap) PTE.present = 1

(cheap) PTE.PFN = PFN

(cheap) retry instruction

Major Steps of A Page Fault



Reality: The Page Fault Handler



Complex logic: Easier to read code than read a book!

Impact of Page Faults

- Each page fault affects the system performance negatively
  - The process experiencing the page fault will not be able to continue until the missing page is brought to the main memory
  - The process will be blocked (moved to the waiting state)
  - Dealing with the page fault involves disk I/O
    - Increased demand to the disk drive
    - Increased waiting time for process experiencing page fault

Memory as a Cache

- As we increase the degree of multiprogramming, over-allocation of memory becomes a problem

- What if we are unable to find a free frame at the time of the page fault?

- OS chooses to page out one or more pages to make room for new page(s) OS is about to bring in
  - The process to replace page(s) is called page replacement policy

Memory as a Cache

- OS keeps a small portion of memory free proactively
  - High watermark (HW) and low watermark (LW)

- When OS notices free memory is below LW (i.e., memory pressure)
  - A background thread (i.e., swap/page daemon) starts running to free memory
  - It evicts pages until there are HW pages available

Beyond Physical Memory: Policies – What to Evict?

Page Replacement

- Page replacement completes the separation between the logical memory and the physical memory
  - Large virtual memory can be provided on a smaller physical memory

- Impact on performance
  - If there are no free frames, two page transfers needed at each page fault!

- We can use a modify (dirty) bit to reduce overhead of page transfers – only modified pages are written back to disk

Page Replacement Policy

- Formalizing the problem
  - Cache management: Physical memory is a cache for virtual memory pages in the system
  - Primary objective:
    - High performance
    - High efficiency
    - Low cost
  - Goal: Minimize cache misses
    - To minimize # times OS has to fetch a page from disk
    - -OR- maximize cache hits

Average Memory Access Time

- Average (or effective) memory access time (**AMAT**) is the metric to calculate the effective memory performance

$$AMAT = (P_{Hit} \cdot T_M) + (P_{Miss} \cdot T_D)$$

- $\mathtt{T_M}$: Cost of accessing memory
- $\mathtt{T_D}$: Cost of accessing disk
- $\mathtt{P_{Hit}}$: Probability of finding data in cache (hit)
  - Hit rate
- $\mathtt{P_{Miss}}$: Probability of not finding data in cache (miss)
  - Miss rate

An Example

- Assuming
  - T_M is 100 nanoseconds (ns), T_D is 10 milliseconds (ms)
  - P_{Hit} is 0.9, and P_{Miss} is 0.1
- `AMAT = 0.9*100ns + 0.1*10ms = 90ns + 1ms = 1.00009ms`
  - Or around 1 millisecond
- What if the hit rate is 99.9%?
  - Result changes to 10.1 microseconds (or μs)
  - Roughly 100 times faster!

First-In First-Out (FIFO)

First-in First-out (FIFO)

- Simplest page replacement algorithm
- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Implementation: FIFO queue holds identifiers of all the pages in memory
  - We replace the page at the head of the queue
  - When a page is brought into memory, it is inserted at the tail of the queue

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0			
1			
2			
0			
1			
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State	
0	Miss		First-in→	0
1	Miss		First-in→	0, 1
2	Miss		First-in→	0, 1, 2
0				
1				
3				
0				
3				
1				
2				
1				

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State	
0	Miss		First-in→	0
1	Miss		First-in→	0, 1
2	Miss		First-in→	0, 1, 2
0	Hit		First-in→	0, 1, 2
1				
3				
0				
3				
1				
2				
1				

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		First-in→ 0
1	Miss		First-in→ 0, 1
2	Miss		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
1	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		First-in→ 0
1	Miss		First-in→ 0, 1
2	Miss		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
1	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
3	Miss		
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State	
0	Miss		First-in→	0
1	Miss		First-in→	0, 1
2	Miss		First-in→	0, 1, 2
0	Hit		First-in→	0, 1, 2
1	Hit		First-in→	0, 1, 2
3	Miss	0	First-in→	1, 2, 3
0				
3				
1				
2				
1				

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		First-in→ 0
1	Miss		First-in→ 0, 1
2	Miss		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
1	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2
3	Miss	0	First-in→ 1, 2, 3
0	Miss	1	First-in→ 2, 3, 0
3	Hit		First-in→ 2, 3, 0
1	Miss	2	First-in→ 3, 0, 1
2	Miss	3	First-in→ 0, 1, 2
1	Hit		First-in→ 0, 1, 2

assume cache size 3

FIFO Replacement Policy

- Idea: items are evicted in the order they are inserted

- Issue: the "oldest" page may contain a heavily used data
  - Will need to bring back that page in near future

FIFO Replacement Policy

- FIFO: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

(a) size 3

Access	Hit	State (after)
1		
2		
3		
4		
1		
2		
5		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

(b) size 4

Access	Hit	State (after)
1		
2		
3		
4		
1		
2		
5		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

FIFO Replacement Policy

- FIFO: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

(a) size 3

Access	Hit	State (after)
1	no	1
2	no	1,2
3	no	1,2,3
4	no	2,3,4
1	no	3,4,1
2	no	4,1,2
5	no	1,2,5
1	yes	1,2,5
2	yes	1,2,5
3	no	2,5,3
4	no	5,3,4
5	yes	5,3,4

(b) size 4

Access	Hit	State (after)
1		
2		
3		
4		
1		
2		
5		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

FIFO Replacement Policy

- FIFO: items are evicted in the order they are inserted
- Example workload: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

(a) size 3

Access	Hit	State (after)
1	no	1
2	no	1,2
3	no	1,2,3
4	no	2,3,4
1	no	3,4,1
2	no	4,1,2
5	no	1,2,5
1	yes	1,2,5
2	yes	1,2,5
3	no	2,5,3
4	no	5,3,4
5	yes	5,3,4

(b) size 4

Access	Hit	State (after)
1	no	1
2	no	1,2
3	no	1,2,3
4	no	1,2,3,4
1	yes	1,2,3,4
2	yes	1,2,3,4
5	no	2,3,4,5
1	no	3,4,5,1
2	no	4,5,1,2
3	no	5,1,2,3
4	no	1,2,3,4
5	no	2,3,4,5

Belady's Anomaly

- Reference string: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
  - Size-3 (3-frames) case results in 9 page faults
  - Size-4 (4-frames) case results in 10 page faults

- Program runs potentially slower w/ more memory!

- Belady's anomaly
  - More frames ➔ more page faults for some access pattern

Random

Random Policy

- Idea: picks a random page to replace
- Simple to implement like FIFO
- No intelligence of preserving locality

Random Policy

- Idea: picks a random page to replace
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	0	1, 2, 3
0	Miss	1	2, 3, 0
3	Hit		2, 3, 0
1	Miss	3	2, 0, 1
2	Hit		2, 0, 1
1	Hit		2, 0, 1

assume cache size 3

How Random Policy Performs?

- Depends entirely on how lucky you are
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 0 1 2 1



How Random Policy Performs?

- Depends entirely on how lucky you are
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 0 1 2 1



Least-Recently-Used (LRU)

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Use the recent pass as an approximation of the near future (using history)
- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0			
1			
2			
0			
1			
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0			
1			
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

Cache size of 3

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1			
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1	Hit		LRU→ 2, 0, 1
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1	Hit		LRU→ 2, 0, 1
3	Miss	2	LRU→ 0, 1, 3
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1	Hit		LRU→ 2, 0, 1
3	Miss	2	LRU→ 0, 1, 3
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 3, 0
3			
1			
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1	Hit		LRU→ 2, 0, 1
3	Miss	2	LRU→ 0, 1, 3
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 3, 0
3	Hit		LRU→ 1, 0, 3
1			
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1	Hit		LRU→ 2, 0, 1
3	Miss	2	LRU→ 0, 1, 3
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 3, 0
3	Hit		LRU→ 1, 0, 3
1	Hit		LRU→ 0, 3, 1
2			
1			

Least-Recently-Used Policy (LRU)

- Idea: evict the page that has not been used for the longest period of time
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		LRU→ 0
1	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1
2	Miss		LRU→ 0, 1, 2
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 2, 0
1	Hit		LRU→ 2, 0, 1
3	Miss	2	LRU→ 0, 1, 3
0	Hit		LRU→ 1, 3, 0
3	Hit		LRU→ 1, 0, 3
1	Hit		LRU→ 0, 3, 1
2	Miss	0	LRU→ 3, 1, 2
1	Hit		LRU→ 3, 2, 1

LRU Stack Implementation

- Stack implementation: keep a stack of page numbers in a doubly linked list form
  - Page referenced, move it to the top
  - Requires quite a few pointers to be changed
  - No search required for replacement operation!

Using a Stack to Approximate LRU



Using a Stack to Approximate LRU



Belady's Optimal

MIN: The Optimal Replacement Policy

- Many years ago Belady demonstrated that there is a simple policy (MIN or OPT) which always leads to fewest number of misses
- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Assumption: we know about the future
- Impossible to implement MIN in practice!

- But it is extremely useful as a practical best-case baseline for comparison purpose

Proof of Optimality for Belady's MIN

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.307.7603&rep=rep1&type=pdf

A Short Proof of Optimality for the **MIN** Cache Replacement Algorithm

Benjamin Van Roy
Stanford University

December 2, 2010

Abstract

The **MIN** algorithm is an offline strategy for deciding which item to replace when writing a new item to a cache. Its optimality was first established by Mattson, Gecsei, Slutz, and Traiger [2] through a lengthy analysis. We provide a short and elementary proof based on a dynamic programming argument.

Keywords: analysis of algorithms, on-line algorithms, caching, paging

1 The MIN Algorithm

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0			
1			
2			
0			
1			
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0			
1			
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

What to evict??

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3			
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

Page 2 happens to be the one that will be accessed furthest in future!

What to evict??

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0			
3			
1			
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0	Hit		0, 1, 3
3	Hit		0, 1, 3
1	Hit		0, 1, 3
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0	Hit		0, 1, 3
3	Hit		0, 1, 3
1	Hit		0, 1, 3
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

What to evict??

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0	Hit		0, 1, 3
3	Hit		0, 1, 3
1	Hit		0, 1, 3
2			
1			

assume cache size 3

Page 1 will be accessed right after page 2. Hence 1 is safe!

What to evict??

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0	Hit		0, 1, 3
3	Hit		0, 1, 3
1	Hit		0, 1, 3
2	Miss	3	0, 1, 2
1			

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0	Hit		0, 1, 3
3	Hit		0, 1, 3
1	Hit		0, 1, 3
2	Miss	3	0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2

assume cache size 3

MIN the Optimal

- Idea: evict the page that will be accessed furthest in the future
- Example workload: 0 1 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 2 1

Access	Hit/Miss?	Evict	Resulting Cache State
0	Miss		0
1	Miss		0, 1
2	Miss		0, 1, 2
0	Hit		0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2
3	Miss	2	0, 1, 3
0	Hit		0, 1, 3
3	Hit		0, 1, 3
1	Hit		0, 1, 3
2	Miss	3	0, 1, 2
1	Hit		0, 1, 2

assume cache size 3

The optimal number of cache hits is **6** for this workload!

ARC: Adaptive Replacement Cache

Adaptive Replacement Cache

- ARC policy
  - Developed and patented by IBM
  - (…Dissuaded its adoption in open-source projects??)

ARC: A SELF-TUNING, LOW OVERHEAD REPLACEMENT CACHE

Nimrod Megiddo and Dharmendra S. Modha
IBM Almaden Research Center, 650 Harry Road, San Jose, CA 95120
Email: {megiddo,dmodha}@almaden.ibm.com

***Abstract*—** We consider the problem of cache management in a demand paging scenario with uniform page sizes. We propose a new cache management policy, namely, Adaptive Replacement Cache (ARC), that has several advantages.

In response to evolving and changing access patterns, ARC *dynamically, adaptively, and continually* balances between the recency and frequency components in an *online* and *self-tuning* fashion. The policy ARC uses a learning rule to adaptively and continually revise its assumptions about the workload.

The policy ARC is *empirically universal*, that is, it empirically performs as well as a certain *fixed replacement policy*–

compression [9] and list updating [10]. Any substantial progress in caching algorithms will affect the entire modern computational stack.

Consider a system consisting of two memory levels: *main* (or *cache*) and *auxiliary*. The cache is assumed to be significantly faster than the auxiliary memory, but is also significantly more expensive. Hence, the size of the cache memory is usually only a fraction of the size of the auxiliary memory. Both memories are managed in units of uniformly sized items known as

Why ARC?

- Offline optimal (MIN): Replaces the page that has the greatest forward distance
  - Requires knowledge of future
  - Provides an upper-bound
- Recency (LRU)
  - Most commonly used policy
- Frequency (LFU)
  - Optimal under independent reference model (IRM)

Mechanisms

- Maintains two LRU lists
  - Pages that have been referenced only once (L1)
  - Pages that have been referenced at least twice (L2)
- Each list has the same length `c` as cache
- Cache contains tops of both lists: `T1` and `T2`
- Bottoms `B1` and `B2` are not in cache
  - Ghost cache

Mechanisms (cont.)

$|T1|+|T2|=c$

Ghost cache
(pages not in memory)



Policy

- ARC attempts to maintain a target size `target_T1` for list `T1` (parameter `p`)
  - ARC continually and dynamically revises `target_T1`

- When cache is full, ARC evicts:
  - The LRU page from `T1` if:

    `|T1| >= target_T1`
  - The LRU page from `T2` otherwise

Policy (cont.)

- If the missing page was in bottom `B1` of `L1`:
  - ARC increases `target_T1`

  `target_T1=min(target_T1+max(|B2|/|B1|,1),c)`

- If the missing page was in bottom `B2` of `L2`:
  - ARC decreases `target_T1`

  `target_T1=max(target_T1-max(|B1|/|B2|,1),0)`

Policy (cont.)

- Intuition
  - Two heuristics compete with each other
  - Each heuristic gets rewarded any time it can show that adding more pages to its top list would have avoided a cache miss
- ARC chooses whether it should care more about recency or frequency of access in eviction decisions
- Note that ARC has no tunable parameter (parameter-less)
  - Cannot get it wrong!

Policy (cont.)

- ARC generally performs much better than LRU
  - Can achieve greater hit rates than LRU w/ the same cache size
  - Or, can achieve same hit rates as LRU w/ a much smaller cache

Mini Exam 1

- 30 minutes next Wednesday, 03/09
  - 7:20 pm – 7:50 pm
- Open book, open note
- CPU scheduling
  - FIFO, SJF, RR, STCF
- Paging
  - VA → PA translation, PT

Miscellaneous: TLB Caching

TLB Replacement Policy

- Cache: When we want to add a new entry to a full TLB, an old entry must be evicted and replaced

- LRU policy
  - Intuition: A page entry that has not recently been used implies it won't likely to be used in the near future

- Random policy
  - Evicts an entry at random

TLB Workloads

- Sequential array accesses can almost always hit in the TLB, and hence are very fast

- What pattern would be slow?

TLB Workloads

- Sequential array accesses can almost always hit in the TLB, and hence are very fast

- What pattern would be slow?
  - Highly random, with no repeat accesses

Workload Characteristics

Workload A

```
int sum = 0;
for (i=0; i<1024; i++) {
    sum += a[i];
}
```

Workload B

```
int sum = 0;
srand(1234);
for (i=0; i<512; i++) {
    sum += a[rand() % N];
}
srand(1234); // same seed
for (i=0; i<512; i++) {
    sum += a[rand() % N];
}
```

Access Patterns



Access Patterns



Workload Locality

- Spatial locality:
  - Future access will be to nearby addresses
- Temporal locality:
  - Future access will be repeated to the same data

Workload Locality

- Spatial locality:
  - Future access will be to nearby addresses
- Temporal locality:
  - Future access will be repeated to the same data
- Q: What TLB characteristics are best for each type?

Workload Locality

- Spatial locality:
  - Future access will be to nearby addresses
- Temporal locality:
  - Future access will be repeated to the same data
- Q: What TLB characteristics are best for each type?
  - One TLB entry holds the translation for one memory page: all accesses to that particular page benefit from this single TLB entry (**spatial** locality)
  - TLB is a small cache (if supporting LRU): memory accesses with **temporal** locality benefit

TLB Replacement Policy

- Cache: When we want to add a new entry to a full TLB, an old entry must be evicted and replaced

- Least-recently-used (LRU) policy
  - Intuition: A page entry that has not recently been used implies it won't likely to be used in the near future

- Random policy
  - Evicts an entry at random

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
0		
0		
0		
0		

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
0		
0		
0		

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
0		
0		
0		

TLB miss

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
0		
0		

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
0		
0		

TLB miss

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
0		

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
0		

TLB miss

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

TLB miss

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	0	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

Now, **0** is the least-recently used item in TLB

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	4	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

Replace 0 with 4

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	4	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

TLB miss

Replace 0 with 4

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	4	?
1	1	?
1	2	?
1	3	?

Accessing 0 again, which was unfortunately just evicted…

LRU Trouble



CPU's TLB cache

Valid	Virt	Phys
1	4	?
1	**0**	**?**
1	2	?
1	3	?

TLB miss

Accessing 0 again, which was unfortunately just evicted…
Replace 1 (which is the least-recently used item at this point) with 0…

Takeaway

- LRU
- Random
- When is each better?
  - Sometimes random is better than a “smart” policy!