

Virtual Memory III

CSE 351 Autumn 2022

Instructor:

Justin Hsia

Teaching Assistants:

Angela Xu

Arjun Narendra

Armin Magness

Assaf Vayner

Carrie Hu

Clare Edmonds

David Dai

Dominick Ta

Effie Zheng

James Froelich


Jenny Peng

Kristina Lansang

Paul Stevans

Renee Ruan

Vincent Xiao



<https://xkcd.com/648/>

Relevant Course Information

- ❖ hw21 due Friday (11/25)
- ❖ Lab 4 due Monday (11/28)
- ❖ hw22 due Wednesday (11/30)

- ❖ “Virtual Section” on Virtual Memory
 - Worksheet and solutions released on Wednesday or Thursday
 - Videos will be released of material review and problem solutions


- ❖ Final Dec. 12-14, regrade requests Dec. 17-18

Reading Review

- ❖ Terminology:
 - Address translation: page hit, page fault
 - Translation Lookaside Buffer (TLB): TLB Hit, TLB Miss

- ❖ Questions from the Reading?


Address Translation: Page Hit



- 1) Processor sends *virtual* address to MMU (*memory management unit*)
- 2-3) MMU fetches PTE from page table in cache/memory
(Uses PTBR to find beginning of page table for current process)
- 4) MMU sends *physical* address to cache/memory requesting data
- 5) Cache/memory sends data to processor

VA = Virtual Address PTEA = Page Table Entry Address PTE = Page Table Entry
 PA = Physical Address Data = Contents of memory stored at VA originally requested by CPU

Address Translation: Page Fault





- 1) Processor sends virtual address to MMU
- 2-3) MMU fetches PTE from page table in cache/memory
- 4) Valid bit is zero, so MMU triggers page fault exception
- 5) Handler identifies victim (and, if dirty, pages it out to disk)
- 6) Handler pages in new page and updates PTE in memory
- 7) Handler returns to original process, restarting faulting instruction

Hmm... Translation Sounds Slow


- ❖ The MMU accesses memory *twice*: once to get the PTE for translation, and then again for the actual memory request
 - The PTEs *may* be cached in L1 like any other memory word
 - But they may be evicted by other data references
 - And a hit in the L1 cache still requires 1-3 cycles
- ❖ *What can we do to make this faster?*
 - **Solution:** add another cache! 🧊

Speeding up Translation with a TLB

- ❖ **Translation Lookaside Buffer (TLB):**
 - Small hardware cache in MMU
 - Split VPN into **TLB Tag** and **TLB Index** based on # of sets in TLB
 - Maps virtual page numbers to physical page numbers
 - Stores *page table entries* for a small number of pages
 - Modern Intel processors have 128 or 256 entries in TLB
 - Much faster than a page table lookup in cache/memory




TLB Hit



❖ A TLB hit eliminates a memory access!

TLB Miss



- ❖ A TLB miss incurs an additional memory access (the PTE)
 - Fortunately, TLB misses are rare

Fetching Data on a Memory Read


1) Address Translation (check TLB)

- Input: VPN, Output: PPN
- *TLB Hit*: Fetch translation, return PPN
- *TLB Miss*: Check page table (in memory)
 - *Page Table Hit*: Load page table entry into TLB
 - *Page Fault*: Fetch page from disk to memory, update corresponding page table entry, then load entry into TLB


2) Fetch Data (check cache)

- Input: physical address, Output: data
- *Cache Hit*: Return data value to processor
- *Cache Miss*: Fetch data value from memory, store it in cache, return it to processor

Address Translation



Address Manipulation



Context Switching Revisited

- ❖ What needs to happen when the CPU switches processes?
 - Registers:
 - Save state of old process, load state of new process
 - Including the Page Table Base Register (PTBR)
 - Memory:
 - Nothing to do! Pages for processes already exist in memory/disk and protected from each other
 - TLB:
 - *invalidate* all entries in TLB – mapping is for old process' VAs
 - Cache:
 - Can leave alone because storing based on PAs – good for shared data

Summary of Address Translation Symbols

❖ Basic Parameters

- $N = 2^n$ Number of addresses in virtual address space
- $M = 2^m$ Number of addresses in physical address space
- $P = 2^p$ Page size (bytes)

❖ Components of the virtual address (VA)

- **VPO** Virtual page offset
- **VPN** Virtual page number
- **TLBI** TLB index
- **TLBT** TLB tag


❖ Components of the physical address (PA)

- **PPO** Physical page offset (same as VPO)
- **PPN** Physical page number

Simple Memory System Example (small)

❖ Addressing

- 14-bit virtual addresses
- 12-bit physical address
- Page size = 64 bytes



Simple Memory System: Page Table

- ❖ Only showing first 16 entries (out of _____)
 - **Note:** showing 2 hex digits for PPN even though only 6 bits
 - **Note:** other management bits not shown, but part of PTE


<i>VPN</i>	<i>PPN</i>	<i>Valid</i>
0	28	1
1	–	0
2	33	1
3	02	1
4	–	0
5	16	1
6	–	0
7	–	0

<i>VPN</i>	<i>PPN</i>	<i>Valid</i>
8	13	1
9	17	1
A	09	1
B	–	0
C	–	0
D	2D	1
E	–	0
F	0D	1

Simple Memory System: TLB

- ❖ 16 entries total
- ❖ 4-way set associative

Why does the TLB ignore the page offset?




Set	Tag	PPN	Valid	Tag	PPN	Valid	Tag	PPN	Valid	Tag	PPN	Valid
0	03	–	0	09	0D	1	00	–	0	07	02	1
1	03	2D	1	02	–	0	04	–	0	0A	–	0
2	02	–	0	08	–	0	06	–	0	03	–	0
3	07	–	0	03	0D	1	0A	34	1	02	–	0

Simple Memory System: Cache

Note: It is just coincidence that the PPN is the same width as the cache Tag

- ❖ Direct-mapped with $K = 4 \text{ B}$, $C/K = 16$
- ❖ Physically addressed



Index	Tag	Valid	B0	B1	B2	B3
0	19	1	99	11	23	11
1	15	0	–	–	–	–
2	1B	1	00	02	04	08
3	36	0	–	–	–	–
4	32	1	43	6D	8F	09
5	0D	1	36	72	F0	1D
6	31	0	–	–	–	–
7	16	1	11	C2	DF	03

Index	Tag	Valid	B0	B1	B2	B3
8	24	1	3A	00	51	89
9	2D	0	–	–	–	–
A	2D	1	93	15	DA	3B
B	0B	0	–	–	–	–
C	12	0	–	–	–	–
D	16	1	04	96	34	15
E	13	1	83	77	1B	D3
F	14	0	–	–	–	–

Current State of Memory System

TLB:

Set	Tag	PPN	V	Tag	PPN	V	Tag	PPN	V	Tag	PPN	V
0	03	-	0	09	0D	1	00	-	0	07	02	1
1	03	2D	1	02	-	0	04	-	0	0A	-	0
2	02	-	0	08	-	0	06	-	0	03	-	0
3	07	-	0	03	0D	1	0A	34	1	02	-	0

Page table (partial):

VPN	PPN	V	VPN	PPN	V
0	28	1	8	13	1
1	-	0	9	17	1
2	33	1	A	09	1
3	02	1	B	-	0
4	-	0	C	-	0
5	16	1	D	2D	1
6	-	0	E	-	0
7	-	0	F	0D	1

Cache:


Index	Tag	V	B0	B1	B2	B3
0	19	1	99	11	23	11
1	15	0	-	-	-	-
2	1B	1	00	02	04	08
3	36	0	-	-	-	-
4	32	1	43	6D	8F	09
5	0D	1	36	72	F0	1D
6	31	0	-	-	-	-
7	16	1	11	C2	DF	03

Index	Tag	V	B0	B1	B2	B3
8	24	1	3A	00	51	89
9	2D	0	-	-	-	-
A	2D	1	93	15	DA	3B
B	0B	0	-	-	-	-
C	12	0	-	-	-	-
D	16	1	04	96	34	15
E	13	1	83	77	1B	D3
F	14	0	-	-	-	-

Memory Request Example #1


Note: It is just coincidence that the PPN is the same width as the cache Tag

❖ Virtual Address: 0x03D4



VPN _____ TLBT _____ TLBI _____ TLB Hit? ____ Page Fault? ____ PPN _____

❖ Physical Address:




CT _____ CI _____ CO _____ Cache Hit? ____ Data (byte) _____

Memory Request Example #2


Note: It is just coincidence that the PPN is the same width as the cache Tag

❖ Virtual Address: 0x038F



VPN _____ TLBT _____ TLBI _____ TLB Hit? ____ Page Fault? ____ PPN _____

❖ Physical Address:




CT _____ CI _____ CO _____ Cache Hit? ____ Data (byte) _____

Memory Request Example #3


Note: It is just coincidence that the PPN is the same width as the cache Tag

❖ Virtual Address: 0x0020



VPN _____ TLBT _____ TLBI _____ TLB Hit? ____ Page Fault? ____ PPN _____

❖ Physical Address:




CT _____ CI _____ CO _____ Cache Hit? ____ Data (byte) _____

Memory Request Example #4


Note: It is just coincidence that the PPN is the same width as the cache Tag

❖ Virtual Address: 0x036B



VPN _____ TLBT _____ TLBI _____ TLB Hit? ____ Page Fault? ____ PPN _____


❖ Physical Address:



CT _____ CI _____ CO _____ Cache Hit? ____ Data (byte) _____

Memory Overview (Data Flow)

```
❖ movl 0x8043ab, %rdi
```



Virtual Memory Summary

- ❖ Programmer's view of virtual memory
 - Each process has its own private linear address space
 - Cannot be corrupted by other processes
- ❖ System view of virtual memory
 - Uses memory efficiently by caching virtual memory pages
 - Efficient only because of locality
 - Simplifies memory management and sharing
 - Simplifies protection by providing permissions checking

BONUS SLIDES

- ❖ Multi-level Page Tables

Page Table Reality


This is extra
(non-testable)
material

- ❖ Just one issue... the numbers don't work out for the story so far!
- ❖ The problem is the page table for each process:
 - Suppose 64-bit VAs, 8 KiB pages, 8 GiB physical memory
 - How many page table entries is that?
 - About how long is each PTE?
 - **Moral:** Cannot use this naïve implementation of the virtual→physical page mapping – it's *way* too big

A Solution: Multi-level Page Tables

This is extra (non-testable) material

This is called a *page walk*



Multi-level Page Tables

This is extra
(non-testable)
material

- ❖ A tree of depth k where each node at depth i has up to 2^j children if part i of the VPN has j bits
- ❖ Hardware for multi-level page tables inherently more complicated
 - But it's a necessary complexity – 1-level does not fit
- ❖ Why it works: Most subtrees are not used at all, so they are never created and definitely aren't in physical memory
 - Parts created can be evicted from cache/memory when not being used
 - Each node can have a size of $\sim 1\text{-}100\text{KB}$
- ❖ But now for a k -level page table, a TLB miss requires $k + 1$ cache/memory accesses
 - Fine so long as TLB misses are rare – motivates larger TLBs


BONUS SLIDES

For Fun: **DRAMMER Security Attack**

- ❖ Why are we talking about this?
 - **Recent:** First announced in October 2016; latest attack variant announced November 2021
 - **Relevant:** Uses your system's memory setup to gain elevated privileges
 - Ties together some of what we've learned about virtual memory and processes
 - **Interesting:** It's a software attack that uses *only hardware vulnerabilities* and requires *no user permissions*

Underlying Vulnerability: Row Hammer

- ❖ Dynamic RAM (DRAM) has gotten denser over time
 - DRAM cells physically closer and use smaller charges
 - More susceptible to “*disturbance errors*” (interference)
- ❖ DRAM capacitors need to be “refreshed” periodically (~64 ms)
 - Lose data when loss of power
 - Capacitors accessed in rows
- ❖ **Rapid accesses to one row can flip bits in an adjacent row!**
 - ~ 100K to 1M times



By Dsimic (modified), CC BY-SA 4.0,
<https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=38868341>

Row Hammer Exploit

❖ Force constant memory access

- Read then flush the cache
- `clflush` – flush cache line
 - Invalidates cache line containing the specified address
 - Not available in all machines or environments
- Want addresses X and Y to fall in activation target row(s)
 - Good to understand how *banks* of DRAM cells are laid out

```
hammertime:  
    mov (X), %eax  
    mov (Y), %ebx  
    clflush (X)  
    clflush (Y)  
    jmp hammertime
```

❖ The row hammer effect was discovered in 2014

- Only works on certain types of DRAM (2010 onwards)
- These techniques target x86 machines

Consequences of Row Hammer

- ❖ Row hammering process can affect another process via memory
 - Circumvents virtual memory protection scheme
 - Memory needs to be in an adjacent row of DRAM
- ❖ Worse: privilege escalation
 - Page tables live in memory!
 - Hope to change PPN to access other parts of memory, or change permission bits
 - **Goal:** gain read/write access to a page containing a page table, hence granting process read/write access to *all of physical memory*

Effectiveness?

- ❖ Doesn't seem so bad – random bit flip in a row of physical memory
 - Vulnerability affected by system setup and physical condition of memory cells
- ❖ **Improvements:**
 - Double-sided row hammering increases speed & chance
 - Do system identification first (*e.g.*, Lab 4)
 - Use timing to infer memory row layout & find “bad” rows
 - Allocate a huge chunk of memory and try many addresses, looking for a reliable/repeatable bit flip
 - Fill up memory with page tables first
 - `fork` extra processes; hope to elevate privileges in any page table

What's DRAMMER?

- ❖ No one previously made a huge fuss
 - **Prevention:** error-correcting codes, target row refresh, higher DRAM refresh rates
 - Often relied on special memory management features
 - Often crashed system instead of gaining control
- ❖ Research group found a *deterministic* way to induce row hammer exploit in a non-x86 system (ARM)
 - Relies on predictable reuse patterns of standard physical memory allocators
 - Universiteit Amsterdam, Graz University of Technology, and University of California, Santa Barbara

DRAMMER Demo Video

- ❖ It's a shell, so not that sexy-looking, but still interesting
 - Apologies that the text is so small on the video



How did we get here?

- ❖ Computing industry demands more and faster storage with lower power consumption
- ❖ Ability of user to circumvent the caching system
 - `clflush` is an unprivileged instruction in x86
 - Other commands exist that skip the cache
- ❖ Availability of virtual to physical address mapping
 - **Example:** `/proc/self/pagemap` on Linux (not human-readable)
- ❖ Google patch for Android (Nov. 8, 2016)
 - Patched the ION memory allocator

More reading for those interested

- ❖ DRAMMER paper:

<https://vvdveen.com/publications/drammer.pdf>

- ❖ Google Project Zero:

<https://googleprojectzero.blogspot.com/2015/03/exploiting-dram-rowhammer-bug-to-gain.html>

- ❖ First rowhammer paper:

<https://users.ece.cmu.edu/~yoonguk/papers/kim-isca14.pdf>

- ❖ Latest non-uniform, frequency-based exploit:

<https://comsec.ethz.ch/research/dram/blacksmith/>

- ❖ Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Row_hammer