Last time in Lecture 6

- Dynamic RAM (DRAM) is main form of main memory storage in use today
  - Holds values on small capacitors, need refreshing (hence dynamic)
  - Slow multi-step access: precharge, read row, read column

- Static RAM (SRAM) is faster but more expensive
  - Used to build on-chip memory for caches

- Cache holds small set of values in fast memory (SRAM) close to processor
  - Need to develop search scheme to find values in cache, and replacement policy to make space for newly accessed locations

- Caches exploit two forms of predictability in memory reference streams
  - Temporal locality, same location likely to be accessed again soon
  - Spatial locality, neighboring location likely to be accessed soon
Recap: Direct-Mapped Cache
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Recap: 2-Way Set-Associative Cache
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Recap: Fully Associative Cache
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Recap: Replacement Policy

In an associative cache, which line from a set should be evicted when the set becomes full?

• Random
• Least-Recently Used (LRU)
  • LRU cache state must be updated on every access
  • True implementation only feasible for small sets (2-way)
  • Pseudo-LRU binary tree often used for 4-8 way
• First-In, First-Out (FIFO) a.k.a. Round-Robin
  • Used in highly associative caches
• Not-Most-Recently Used (NMRU)
  • FIFO with exception for most-recently used line or lines

This is a second-order effect. Why?

Replacement only happens on misses
CPU-Cache Interaction
(5-stage pipeline)
Improving Cache Performance

Average memory access time (AMAT) = Hit time + Miss rate x Miss penalty

To improve performance:
- reduce the hit time
- reduce the miss rate
- reduce the miss penalty

What is best cache design for 5-stage pipeline?

Biggest cache that doesn’t increase hit time past 1 cycle (approx 8-32KB in modern technology)

[design issues more complex with deeper pipelines and/or out-of-order superscalar processors]
Causes of Cache Misses: The 3 C’s

**Compulsory:** first reference to a line (a.k.a. cold start misses)
  
  – *misses that would occur even with infinite cache*

**Capacity:** cache is too small to hold all data needed by the program
  
  – *misses that would occur even under perfect replacement policy*

**Conflict:** misses that occur because of collisions due to line-placement strategy
  
  – *misses that would not occur with ideal full associativity*
Effect of Cache Parameters on Performance

- Larger cache size
  + reduces capacity and conflict misses
  - hit time will increase

- Higher associativity
  + reduces conflict misses
  - may increase hit time

- Larger line size
  + reduces compulsory and capacity (reload) misses
  - increases conflict misses and miss penalty
Figure B.9 Total miss rate (top) and distribution of miss rate (bottom) for each size cache according to the three C's for the data in Figure B.8. The top diagram shows the actual data cache miss rates, while the bottom diagram shows the percentage in each category. (Space allows the graphs to show one extra cache size than can fit in Figure B.8.)
Recap: Line Size and Spatial Locality

A line is unit of transfer between the cache and memory

- Larger line size has distinct hardware advantages
  - less tag overhead
  - exploit fast burst transfers from DRAM
  - exploit fast burst transfers over wide busses

What are the disadvantages of increasing line size?

*Fewer lines => more conflicts. Can waste bandwidth.*
Figure B.10 Miss rate versus block size for five different-sized caches. Note that miss rate actually goes up if the block size is too large relative to the cache size. Each line represents a cache of different size. Figure B.11 shows the data used to plot these lines. Unfortunately, SPEC2000 traces would take too long if block size were included, so these data are based on SPEC92 on a DECstation 5000 (Gee et al. 1993).
Write Policy Choices

▪ Cache hit:
  – **write through**: write both cache & memory
    • Generally higher traffic but simpler pipeline & cache design
  – **write back**: write cache only, memory is written only when the entry is evicted
    • A dirty bit per line further reduces write-back traffic
    • Must handle 0, 1, or 2 accesses to memory for each load/store

▪ Cache miss:
  – **no write allocate**: only write to main memory
  – **write allocate** (aka fetch on write): fetch into cache

▪ Common combinations:
  – write through and no write allocate
  – write back with write allocate
Write Performance
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Reducing Write Hit Time

**Problem:** Writes take two cycles in memory stage, one cycle for tag check plus one cycle for data write if hit

**Solutions:**
- Design data RAM that can perform read and write in one cycle, restore old value after tag miss
- Fully-associative (CAM Tag) caches: Word line only enabled if hit
- Pipelined writes: Hold write data for store in single buffer ahead of cache, write cache data during next store’s tag check
Pipelining Cache Writes

Address and Store Data From CPU

Tag → Index → Delayed Write Addr. → Delayed Write Data → Store Data

Tags → Load/Store

Load Data to CPU

Data from a store hit written into data portion of cache during tag access of subsequent store
Processor is not stalled on writes, and read misses can go ahead of write to main memory

**Problem:** Write buffer may hold updated value of location needed by a read miss

**Simple solution:** on a read miss, wait for the write buffer to go empty

**Faster solution:** Check write buffer addresses against read miss addresses, if no match, allow read miss to go ahead of writes, else, return value in write buffer
Reducing Tag Overhead with Sub-Blocks

- **Problem**: Tags are too large, i.e., too much overhead
  - Simple solution: Larger lines, but miss penalty could be large.

- **Solution**: Sub-block placement (aka sector cache)
  - A valid bit added to units smaller than full line, called sub-blocks
  - Only read a sub-block on a miss
  - *If a tag matches, is the word in the cache?*

```
  100  1  1  1  1
  300  1  1  0  0
  204  0  1  0  1
```
CS152 Administrivia

- Lab 1 due at start of class on Monday Feb 12
- PS 2 out on Wednesday, due Wednesday Feb 14
- Friday’s sections will review PS 1 and solutions
CS252 Administrivia

- Start thinking of class projects and forming teams of two
- Proposal due Monday March 5th
Multilevel Caches

**Problem:** A memory cannot be large and fast

**Solution:** Increasing sizes of cache at each level

Local miss rate = misses in cache / accesses to cache

Global miss rate = misses in cache / CPU memory accesses

Misses per instruction = misses in cache / number of instructions
Figure B.14 Miss rates versus cache size for multilevel caches. Second-level caches smaller than the sum of the two 64 KiB first-level caches make little sense, as reflected in the high miss rates. After 256 KiB the single cache is within 10% of the global miss rates. The miss rate of a single-level cache versus size is plotted against the local miss rate and global miss rate of a second-level cache using a 32 KiB first-level cache. The L2 caches (unified) were two-way set associative with replacement. Each had split L1 instruction and data caches that were 64 KiB two-way set associative with LRU replacement. The block size for both L1 and L2 caches was 64 bytes. Data were collected as in Figure B.4.
Presence of L2 influences L1 design

- **Use smaller L1 if there is also L2**
  - Trade increased L1 miss rate for reduced L1 hit time
  - Backup L2 reduces L1 miss penalty
  - Reduces average access energy

- **Use simpler write-through L1 with on-chip L2**
  - Write-back L2 cache absorbs write traffic, doesn’t go off-chip
  - At most one L1 miss request per L1 access (no dirty victim write back) simplifies pipeline control
  - Simplifies coherence issues
  - Simplifies error recovery in L1 (can use just parity bits in L1 and reload from L2 when parity error detected on L1 read)
Figure B.15 Relative execution time by second-level cache size. The two bars are for different clock cycles for an L2 cache hit. The reference execution time of 1.00 is for an 8192 KiB second-level cache with a 1-clock-cycle latency on a second-level hit. These data were collected the same way as in Figure B.14, using a simulator to imitate the Alpha 21264.
Inclusion Policy

- **Inclusive multilevel cache:**
  - Inner cache can only hold lines also present in outer cache
  - External coherence snoop access need only check outer cache

- **Exclusive multilevel caches:**
  - Inner cache may hold lines not in outer cache
  - Swap lines between inner/outer caches on miss
  - Used in AMD Athlon with 64KB primary and 256KB secondary cache

Why choose one type or the other?
Itanium-2 On-Chip Caches
(Intel/HP, 2002)

**Level 1:** 16KB, 4-way s.a., 64B line, quad-port (2 load+2 store), single cycle latency

**Level 2:** 256KB, 4-way s.a, 128B line, quad-port (4 load or 4 store), five cycle latency

**Level 3:** 3MB, 12-way s.a., 128B line, single 32B port, twelve cycle latency
Power 7 On-Chip Caches [IBM 2009]

- 32KB L1 I$/core
- 32KB L1 D$/core
- 3-cycle latency
- 256KB Unified L2$/core
- 8-cycle latency
- 32MB Unified Shared L3$
- Embedded DRAM (eDRAM)
- 25-cycle latency to local slice
IBM z196 Mainframe Caches 2010

- 96 cores (4 cores/chip, 24 chips/system)
  - Out-of-order, 3-way superscalar @ 5.2GHz
- L1: 64KB I-$/core + 128KB D-$/core
- L2: 1.5MB private/core (144MB total)
- L3: 24MB shared/chip (eDRAM) (576MB total)
- L4: 768MB shared/system (eDRAM)
Prefetching

- Speculate on future instruction and data accesses and fetch them into cache(s)
  - Instruction accesses easier to predict than data accesses

- Varieties of prefetching
  - Hardware prefetching
  - Software prefetching
  - Mixed schemes

- What types of misses does prefetching affect?
Issues in Prefetching

- Usefulness – should produce hits
- Timeliness – not late and not too early
- Cache and bandwidth pollution
Hardware Instruction Prefetching

Instruction prefetch in Alpha AXP 21064

- Fetch two lines on a miss; the requested line (i) and the next consecutive line (i+1)
- Requested line placed in cache, and next line in instruction stream buffer
- If miss in cache but hit in stream buffer, move stream buffer line into cache and prefetch next line (i+2)
### Hardware Data Prefetching

- **Prefetch-on-miss:**
  - Prefetch b + 1 upon miss on b

- **One-Block Lookahead (OBL) scheme**
  - Initiate prefetch for block b + 1 when block b is accessed
  - Why is this different from doubling block size?
  - Can extend to N-block lookahead

- **Strided prefetch**
  - If observe sequence of accesses to line b, b+N, b+2N, then prefetch b+3N etc.

- **Example:** IBM Power 5 [2003] supports eight independent streams of strided prefetch per processor, prefetching 12 lines ahead of current access
Software Prefetching

for (i=0; i < N; i++) {
    prefetch( &a[i + 1] );
    prefetch( &b[i + 1] );
    SUM = SUM + a[i] * b[i];
}
Software Prefetching Issues

- Timing is the biggest issue, not predictability
  - If you prefetch very close to when the data is required, you might be too late
  - Prefetch too early, cause pollution
  - Estimate how long it will take for the data to come into L1, so we can set P appropriately
  - Why is this hard to do?

```c
for(i=0; i < N; i++) {
    prefetch( &a[i + P] );
    prefetch( &b[i + P] );
    SUM = SUM + a[i] * b[i];
}

Must consider cost of prefetch instructions
```
Compiler Optimizations

- Restructuring code affects the data access sequence
  - Group data accesses together to improve spatial locality
  - Re-order data accesses to improve temporal locality

- Prevent data from entering the cache
  - Useful for variables that will only be accessed once before being replaced
  - Needs mechanism for software to tell hardware not to cache data ("no-allocate" instruction hints or page table bits)

- Kill data that will never be used again
  - Streaming data exploits spatial locality but not temporal locality
  - Replace into dead cache locations
Loop Interchange

```c
for(j=0; j < N; j++) {
    for(i=0; i < M; i++) {
        x[i][j] = 2 * x[i][j];
    }
}
```

```c
for(i=0; i < M; i++) {
    for(j=0; j < N; j++) {
        x[i][j] = 2 * x[i][j];
    }
}
```

What type of locality does this improve?
Loop Fusion

```cpp
for(i=0; i < N; i++)
    a[i] = b[i] * c[i];

for(i=0; i < N; i++)
    d[i] = a[i] * c[i];

for(i=0; i < N; i++)
{
    a[i] = b[i] * c[i];
    d[i] = a[i] * c[i];
}
```

What type of locality does this improve?
Matrix Multiply, Naïve Code

```c
for(i=0; i < N; i++)
    for(j=0; j < N; j++) {
        r = 0;
        for(k=0; k < N; k++)
            r = r + y[i][k] * z[k][j];
        x[i][j] = r;
    }
```

Not touched  Old access  New access
Matrix Multiply with Cache Tiling

for(jj=0; jj < N; jj[jj+=B])
  for(kk=0; kk < N; kk[kk+=B])
    for(i=0; i < N; i++)
      for(j=jj; j < min(jj+B,N); j++) {
        r = 0;
        for(k=kk; k < min(kk+B,N); k++)
          r = r + y[i][k] * z[k][j];
        x[i][j] = x[i][j] + r;
      }

What type of locality does this improve?
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