CS 110 Computer Architecture *Caches Part 2*

Instructor: Sören Schwertfeger

http://shtech.org/courses/ca/

School of Information Science and Technology SIST

ShanghaiTech University

Slides based on UC Berkley's CS61C



 Principle of locality + memory hierarchy presents programmer with ≈ as much memory as is available in the *cheapest* technology at the ≈ speed offered by the *fastest* technology

Review: Adding Cache to Computer



Caches Review

- Principle of Locality
 - Temporal Locality and Spatial Locality
- Hierarchy of Memories (speed/size/cost per bit) to Exploit Locality
- Cache copy of data in lower level of memory hierarchy
- Direct Mapped to find block in cache using Tag field and Valid bit for Hit
- Cache design organization choices:
 - Fully Associative, Set-Associative, Direct-Mapped

Cache Organizations

- "Fully Associative": Block can go anywhere
 - First design in lecture
 - Note: No Index field, but 1 comparator/block
- "Direct Mapped": Block goes one place
 - Note: Only 1 comparator
 - Number of sets = number blocks
- "N-way Set Associative": N places for a block
 - Number of sets = number of blocks / N
 - N comparators
 - Fully Associative: N = number of blocks
 - Direct Mapped: N = 1

Processor Address Fields used by Cache Controller

- Block Offset: Byte address within block
- Set Index: Selects which set
- Tag: Remaining portion of processor address

Processor Address (32-bits total)

Tag	Set Index	Block offset
-----	-----------	--------------

- Size of Index = log2 (number of sets)
- Size of Tag = Address size Size of Index – log2 (number of bytes/block)

Direct-Mapped Cache Review

• One word blocks, cache size = 1K words (or 4KB)



Handling Stores with Write-Through

- Store instructions write to memory, changing values
- Need to make sure cache and memory have same values on writes: 2 policies
- 1) Write-Through Policy: write cache and write through the cache to memory
 - Every write eventually gets to memory
 - Too slow, so include Write Buffer to allow processor to continue once data in Buffer
 - Buffer updates memory in parallel to processor

Write-Through Cache

- Write both values in cache and in memory
- Write buffer stops CPU from stalling if memory cannot keep up
- Write buffer may have multiple entries to absorb bursts of writes
- What if store misses in cache?



Handling Stores with Write-Back

- 2) Write-Back Policy: write only to cache and then write cache block *back* to memory when evict block from cache
 - Writes collected in cache, only single write to memory per block
 - Include bit to see if wrote to block or not, and then only write back if bit is set
 - Called "Dirty" bit (writing makes it "dirty")

Write-Back Cache

- Store/cache hit, write data in cache only & set dirty bit
 - Memory has stale value
- Store/cache miss, read data from memory, then update and set dirty bit
 - "Write-allocate" policy
- Load/cache hit, use value from cache
- On any miss, write back evicted block, only if dirty. Update cache with new block and clear dirty bit.



Write-Through vs. Write-Back

- Write-Through:
 - Simpler control logic
 - More predictable timing simplifies processor control logic
 - Easier to make reliable, since memory always has copy of data (big idea: Redundancy!)

- Write-Back
 - More complex control logic
 - More variable timing (0,1,2 memory accesses per cache access)
 - Usually reduces write traffic
 - Harder to make reliable, sometimes cache has only copy of data

Cache (Performance) Terms

- Hit rate: fraction of accesses that hit in the cache
- Miss rate: 1 Hit rate
- Miss penalty: time to replace a block from lower level in memory hierarchy to cache
- Hit time: time to access cache memory (including tag comparison)

• Abbreviation: "\$" = cache (cash ...)

Average Memory Access Time (AMAT)

 Average Memory Access Time (AMAT) is the average time to access memory considering both hits and misses in the cache

AMAT = Time for a hit

+ Miss rate × Miss penalty

Question

AMAT = Time for a hit + Miss rate x Miss penalty Given a 200 psec clock, a miss penalty of 50 clock cycles, a miss rate of 0.02 misses per instruction and a cache hit time of 1 clock cycle, what is AMAT?

- □ A: ≤200 psec
- □ B: 400 psec
- □ C: 600 psec
- □ D: ≥ 800 psec

Example: Direct-Mapped Cache with 4 Single-Word Blocks, Worst-Case Reference String

 Consider the main memory address (words) reference string of word numbers: 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4

Start with an empty cache - all blocks initially marked as not valid



Example: Direct-Mapped Cache with 4 Single-Word Blocks, Worst-Case Reference String

 Consider the main memory address (words) reference string of word numbers: 0 4 0 4 0 4 0 4

Start with an empty cache - all blocks initially marked as not valid



- 8 requests, 8 misses
- Ping-pong effect due to conflict misses two memory locations that map into the same cache block

Alternative Block Placement Schemes



- DM placement: mem block 12 in 8 block cache: only one cache block where mem block 12 can be found—(12 modulo 8) = 4
- SA placement: four sets x 2-ways (8 cache blocks), memory block 12 in set (12 mod 4) = 0; either element of the set
- FA placement: mem block 12 can appear in any cache blocks

Example: 2-Way Set Associative \$ (4 words = 2 sets x 2 ways per set)



Main Memory

One word blocks Two low order bits define the byte in the word (32b words)

Q: How do we find it?

Use next 1 low order memory address bit to determine which cache set (i.e., modulo the number of sets in the cache)

Admin

Regrade Requests open till next Tuesday (April 18)



Example: 4-Word 2-Way SA \$ Same Reference String

• Consider the main memory address (word) reference string

Start with an empty cache - all blocks $0\ 4\ 0\ 4\ 0\ 4\ 0\ 4$ initially marked as not valid



Example: 4-Word 2-Way SA \$ Same Reference String

• Consider the main memory address (word) reference string

Start with an empty cache - all blocks $0\ 4\ 0\ 4\ 0\ 4\ 0\ 4$ initially marked as not valid



- 8 requests, 2 misses
- Solves the ping-pong effect in a direct-mapped cache due to conflict misses since now two memory locations that map into the same cache set can co-exist!

Four-Way Set-Associative Cache

• $2^8 = 256$ sets each with four ways (each with one block)



Different Organizations of an Eight-Block Cache

One-way set associative (direct mapped) Tag Data Block 0 Two-way set associative 1 Set Tag Data Tag Data 2 0 3 1 4 2 5 3 6 7 Four-way set associative Tag Data Tag Data Tag Data Tag Data Set 0 1

Eight-way set associative (fully associative)

 Tag
 Data
 Data
 <thData</th>
 <thData</th>
 <thData</th

Total size of \$ in blocks is equal to number of sets × associativity. For fixed \$ size and fixed block size, increasing associativity decreases number of sets while increasing number of elements per set. With eight blocks, an 8-way setassociative \$ is same as a fully associative \$.

Range of Set-Associative Caches

• For a *fixed-size* cache and fixed block size, each increase by a factor of two in associativity doubles the number of blocks per set (i.e., the number or ways) and halves the number of sets – decreases the size of the index by 1 bit and increases the size of the tag by 1



Costs of Set-Associative Caches

- N-way set-associative cache costs
 - N comparators (delay and area)
 - MUX delay (set selection) before data is available
 - Data available after set selection (and Hit/Miss decision).
 DM \$: block is available before the Hit/Miss decision
 - In Set-Associative, not possible to just assume a hit and continue and recover later if it was a miss
- When miss occurs, which way's block selected for replacement?
 - Least Recently Used (LRU): one that has been unused the longest (principle of temporal locality)
 - Must track when each way's block was used relative to other blocks in the set
 - For 2-way SA \$, one bit per set → set to 1 when a block is referenced; reset the other way's bit (i.e., "last used")

Cache Replacement Policies

- Random Replacement
 - Hardware randomly selects a cache evict
- Least-Recently Used
 - Hardware keeps track of access history
 - Replace the entry that has not been used for the longest time
 - For 2-way set-associative cache, need one bit for LRU replacement
- Example of a Simple "Pseudo" LRU Implementation
 - Assume 64 Fully Associative entries
 - Hardware replacement pointer points to one cache entry
 - Whenever access is made to the entry the pointer points to:
 - Move the pointer to the next entry
 - Otherwise: do not move the pointer
 - (example of "not-most-recently used" replacement policy)



Benefits of Set-Associative Caches

 Choice of DM \$ versus SA \$ depends on the cost of a miss versus the cost of implementation



 Largest gains are in going from direct mapped to 2-way (20%+ reduction in miss rate)

Understanding Cache Misses: The 3Cs

- Compulsory (cold start or process migration, 1st reference):
 - First access to block impossible to avoid; small effect for long running programs
 - Solution: increase block size (increases miss penalty; very large blocks could increase miss rate)
- Capacity:
 - Cache cannot contain all blocks accessed by the program
 - Solution: increase cache size (may increase access time)
- **Conflict** (collision):
 - Multiple memory locations mapped to the same cache location
 - Solution 1: increase cache size
 - Solution 2: increase associativity (may increase access time)

How to Calculate 3C's using Cache Simulator

- 1. Compulsory: set cache size to infinity and fully associative, and count number of misses
- 2. Capacity: Change cache size from infinity, usually in powers of 2, and count misses for each reduction in size
 - 16 MB, 8 MB, 4 MB, ... 128 KB, 64 KB, 16 KB
- **3.** Conflict: Change from fully associative to n-way set associative while counting misses
 - Fully associative, 16-way, 8-way, 4-way, 2-way, 1-way



- Three sources of misses (SPEC2000 integer and floating-point benchmarks)
 - Compulsory misses 0.006%; not visible
 - Capacity misses, function of cache size
 - Conflict portion depends on associativity and cache size

Improving Cache Performance AMAT = Time for a hit + Miss rate x Miss penalty

- Reduce the time to hit in the cache
 - E.g., Smaller cache
- Reduce the miss rate
 - E.g., Bigger cache
- Reduce the miss penalty
 - E.g., Use multiple cache levels

Impact of Larger Cache on AMAT?

- 1) Reduces misses (what kind(s)?)
- 2) Longer Access time (Hit time): smaller is faster
 Increase in hit time will likely add another stage to the pipeline
- At some point, increase in hit time for a larger cache may overcome the improvement in hit rate, yielding a decrease in performance
- Computer architects expend considerable effort optimizing organization of cache hierarchy – big impact on performance and power!

Questions: Impact of longer cache blocks on misses?

- For fixed total cache capacity and associativity, what is effect of longer blocks on each type of miss:
 - A: Decrease, B: Unchanged, C: Increase
- Compulsory?
- Capacity?
- Conflict?

Questions: Impact of longer blocks on AMAT

- For fixed total cache capacity and associativity, what is effect of longer blocks on each component of AMAT:
 - A: Decrease, B: Unchanged, C: Increase
- Hit Time?
- Miss Rate?
- Miss Penalty?

Question:

For fixed capacity and fixed block size, how does increasing associativity effect AMAT?

A: Increases hit time, decreases miss rate B: Decreases hit time, decreases miss rate C: Increases hit time, increases miss rate D: Decreases hit time, increases miss rate

Cache Design Space

- Several interacting dimensions
 - Cache size
 - Block size
 - Associativity
 - Replacement policy
 - Write-through vs. write-back
 - Write allocation
- Optimal choice is a compromise
 - Depends on access characteristics
 - Workload
 - Use (I-cache, D-cache)
 - Depends on technology / cost
- Simplicity often wins



And, In Conclusion ...

- Name of the Game: Reduce AMAT
 - Reduce Hit Time
 - -Reduce Miss Rate
 - -Reduce Miss Penalty
- Cache Misses: Compulsory Capacity Conflict
- Balance cache parameters (Capacity, associativity, block size)