Prospects for Functional Address Translation

Conor Hetland Georgios Tziantzioulis Brian Suchy

Kyle Hale Nikos Hardavellas

Prescience Lab Computer Science Northwestern University

> pdinda.org presciencelab.org





Peter Dinda



Paper in a Nutshell

- Page tables implement address translation *functions*
- Can we implement these *functions* better on future (malleable) hardware?

Faster/more space efficient/easier to generate+update

- We studied four models for doing this
 - How well do they work for actual x64 page tables from HPC and other workloads?
- Results are mixed
 - Most promising technique: multiplexor tree

Outline

- Address translation functions
- Traditional paging and alternative models
- Our techniques and results
 - Perfect hashing for inverted page tables
 - Espresso-minimized PLAs
 - Task-specific functional language for FPGA synthesis
 - Multiplexor trees
- Conclusions and future work
 - CARAT

Motivation

- Address translation is a hot topic again
- Driven by... changing workloads
 - Database engines, cloud services, unikernels
- Driven by... TLB costs
 - TLB misses => lower performance
 - TLB reach may be insufficient
 - TLBs consume significant power/energy/area
 - Virtualization compounds these
- Our interest: parallel workloads and HPC
 - Part of a project to rethink the parallel hardware/software stack (interweaving.org)

Address Translation Functions

Every Address (ifetch, data read/write/ control access / etc)



Traditional Paging (x64, others similar)

- TLB essential
 - Must avoid almost all actual page table references
- TLB design and cache design are tightly coupled, limiting cache design





It Doesn't Need to be Page Tables

Every Address (ifetch, data read/write/ control access / etc)



Locales for Functional Address Translation (FAT)

Most Restrictive - Lowest Latency / Smallest State



Least Restrictive Highest Latency / Largest State

Core-TLB

- Most extreme
- Replace TLB!
 Perhaps without misses!

- Must operate at least as fast as a TLB
 - Cannot have much state





Workloads

Our tool captures Linux page table snapshots (processes)

- General Purpose Servers
 - 2 machines, 19 days, ~1.2 million snapshots
- Mantevo
 - 13 snapshots, mid-run, of 13 benchmarks
- NAS
 - 40 snapshots, 4 each over 10 benchmarks
- PARSEC
 - 70 snapshots, 4-14 each over 7 benchmarks
- HPCCG on Legion
 - 221 snapshots, 1 second intervals
- Synthetic
 - 3 contrived snapshots

Evaluation Criteria

- Generation time
 - How quickly can we transform the mapping into the function?
 - By direct measurement of cost of software tool
- Space complexity
 - Estimate hardware resource cost
 - Ideally, by synthesis to FPGA via Verilog using Quartus, then counting logic blocks
- Lookup time
 - Estimate cost of lookup
 - Ideally by path length / cycle time of FPGA
- Caveat: update time not considered

Inverted Page Tables with Perfect Hashing

- IPT provides single-level page table entry lookup without hash collisions...
- …Perfect hashing makes hash functions that have no collisions
- Two generators considered
 - Minimum Perfect Hashing CHM algorithm from CMPH
 - Perfect Hashing GPERF
- CHM/CMPH is most interesting





Function Body Is Compact, But Needs Considerable State



Lookups Are Tricky

- Hash function involves two memory references
 With Inverse PT references, close to a forward PT...
- GPERF has contrasting results
 - MUCH slower to generate no O(n) guarantee
 - Function body larger, but state much smaller
 - Lookup likely quite fast since state will not require memory accesses

Espresso-Minimized PLAs

- Address translation function as a bit-by-bit truth table
- Classic Berkeley Espresso truth table minimizer for PLA-style reconfigurable logic
 - Imagine future processor with a PLA, not an FPGA
- For space complexity: synthesis by Quartus for FPGA
 - Limitation of evaluation
 - Real hardware would take Espresso output directly



Generation Costs Are High

- 10s of minutes of CPU time for Espressominimization
 - Would always be needed
- Hours to synthesize into FPGA logic

 Only needed for our evaluation approach

Generation time limits the number of snapshots we can consider

Space Complexity Is Probably Linear in Address Space Size – Plus No Extra State



Lookup Time Likely Fast

- PLA is fundamentally two-level logic
- Provided sufficiently high fan-in/fan-out, lookup would be single-cycle

• Lots of caveats here...

Motivating Multiplexor Trees: Page Table Entries Respond Well to Run-length-encoding

Multiplexor Trees

• Think Linux memory map red-black tree...

(VPN, length) -> PPN

• ... but realized as a hardware decision tree

A Two-Region Multiplexor Tree in Verilog

```
always @(vpn)
if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[0]) &&
    (vpn<(reg_vpn[0] + reg_num[0])))
    out = reg_ppn[0] + (vpn - reg_vpn[0]);
else
    if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[1]) &&
        (vpn<(reg_vpn[1] + reg_num[1])))
        out = reg_ppn[1] + (vpn - reg_vpn[1]);
    else
        out = 'hfffffffffffff;</pre>
```

• Search process is this hardware tree

A 16-Region Multiplexor Tree in Verilog (trust me!)

else // vpn>=reg_vpn[1]+reg_num[1] if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[2]) && (vpn<(reg_vpn[2]+reg_num[2]))) out = reg_ppn[2] + (vpn-reg_vpn[2]); out = 'hfffffffffffffff else // vpn>=reg_upn[3]+reg_num[3]
if ((vpn>=reg_upn[4]) && (vpn-(reg_vpn[4])+reg_num[4])))
out = reg_ppn[4] + (vpn-reg_upn[4]);
else if ((vpn-reg_upn[4]))
if ((vpn>=reg_upn[2]) && (vpn-reg_upn[2])+reg_num[2])))
out = reg_ppn[2] + (vpn-reg_upn[2]); else out = 'hfffffffffffffff; else // vpn>=reg_vpn[4]+reg_rum[4]
if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[4]) && (vpn(reg_vpn[4])+reg_rum[4])))
out = reg_ppn[4] + (vpn-reg_vpn[4]);
else if ((vpn(reg_vpn[4]))
if ((vpn)=reg_vpn[3]) && (vpn((reg_vpn[3]+reg_rum[3])))
out = reg_ppn[3] + (vpn-reg_vpn[3]); out = 'hffffffffffffffff: else else out = 'hfffffffffffff;; else // vpn>=reg_vpn[7]+reg_num[7]
 if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[10]) && (vpn<(reg_vpn[10]+reg_num[10])))
 out = reg_ppn[10] + (vpn==reg_vpn[10]);
 else if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[2])) && (vpn<(reg_vpn[7])+reg_num[7])))
 out = reg_ppn[7] + (vpn==reg_vpn[7]);
 else if ((vpn<reg_vpn[7]))
 if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[6]) && (vpn<reg_vpn[6])+reg_num[6])))
 if ((vpn==reg_ppn[6]) && (vpn<reg_vpn[6]);
 out = reg_ppn[6] + reg_num[6]));
 cot = reg_ppn[6] && (vpn<reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_ppn[6] + (vpn=reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + (vpn=reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6]);
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6] + reg_vpn[6];
 cot = reg_vpn[6] + r out = 'hffffffffffffffff; if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[9]) && (vpn<(reg_vpn[9]+reg_num[9])))
out = reg_ppn[9] + (vpn-reg_vpn[9]);</pre> else out = 'hfffffffffffff;; else // vpn>ereg_vpn[10];reg_num[10] if ((vpn>ereg_vpn[12]) && (vpn-(reg_vpn[12])+reg_num[12])))) out = reg_ppn[12] + (vpn-reg_vpn[12]); else if ((vpn-reg_vpn[10]) && (vpn-(reg_vpn[10]); if ((vpn-reg_vpn[10]) + (vpn-reg_vpn[10]); else if ((vpn-reg_vpn[10]) + (vpn-reg_vpn[10]); if ((vpn>ereg_vpn[10]) = (vpn-reg_vpn[10]); out = reg_ppn[10] + (vpn-reg_vpn[10]); out = 'hfffffffffffff;; else // vpn>=reg_vpn[10]+reg_num[10] if ((vpn>=reg_vpn[11]) && (vpn<(reg_vpn[11]+reg_num[11]))) out = reg_ppn[11] + (vpn-reg_vpn[11]); out - 'bfffffffffffffff else out = 'hffffffffffffff; else // vpn>=reg_vpn[13]+reg_num[13] g_upilijsreg_umu[13]) && (upn<(reg_upn[13]+reg_umu[13]))) out = reg_upp[13] + (upn-reg_upn[13]); else if ((upnsreg_upn[13])) if ((upnsreg_upn[12]) && (upn(reg_upn[12]+reg_umu[12]))) out = reg_upp[12] + (upn-reg_upn[12]); olse else out = 'hffffffffffffff;; else else out = 'hfffffffffffff;

23

Bespoke Multiplexor Trees

Registered Multiplexor Trees

• Generate *generic* multiplexor tree of n regions that can be *loaded* with any run-length-encoded function that has n or fewer regions

Generation Costs

• Generally high (hours)

- Milliseconds to generate, hours to synthesize

• Matters for bespoke

- Does not matter for registered
 - We can reuse the synthesized hardware just by loading its registers with other values

Space Complexity is Reasonable (Bespoke)

Space Complexity is Reasonable (Registered)

Lookup Cost

- Log depth circuit (n=number of regions)
- Single cycle for what we synthesized
 - But this is for a slow FPGA
 - And depends on scale
- Bespoke versus registered does not matter
- Kernel can potentially control these costs through memory allocation model
 - Enhance virtual->physical contiguity -> "contigify"

Speculation About Best Fits

Most Restrictive - Lowest Latency / Smallest State

Least Restrictive Highest Latency / Largest State

Related Work

- DIY Address Translation (Alam et al, ISCA 17)
- Hash, Don't Cache (Yaniv et al, SIGMETRICS 16)
- Translation Caching/SpecTLB (Barr et al, ISCA 10)
- Segments / RLE tables (Basu et al, ISCA 13)
- Nested Paging (Bhargava et al, ASPLOS 08)
- Bhattacharjee et al (numerous, present)
- Numerous ideas from the last time address translation was a hot topic (mid '90s)

Current Direction: CARAT

- Compiler- and Runtime-based Address Translation
- No address translation all physical addressing
 Optionally no page abstraction
- Compiler and runtime jointly enforce protection and enable data mobility
- Paper forthcoming!

Paper in a Nutshell

- Page tables implement address translation *functions*
- Can we implement these *functions* better on future (malleable) hardware?

Faster/more space efficient/easier to generate+update

- We studied four models for doing this
 - How well do they work for actual x64 page tables from HPC and other workloads?
- Results are mixed
 - Most promising technique: multiplexor tree

For More Information

- Peter Dinda
 - pdinda@northwestern.edu
 - <u>http://pdinda.org</u>
- Interweaving Project
 - <u>http://interweaving.org</u>
- Prescience Lab
 - <u>http://presciencelab.org</u>
- Acknowledgements
 - NSF, DOE, Intel

