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

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

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
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Replacement Policy

In an associative cache, which block 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 Least Recently Used (NLRU)
  • FIFO with exception for most recently used block or blocks

This is a second-order effect. Why?

Replacement only happens on misses

Block Size and Spatial Locality

Block is unit of transfer between the cache and memory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Word0</th>
<th>Word1</th>
<th>Word2</th>
<th>Word3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 word block, b=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Split CPU address

- block address
  - 32-b bits
  - \(2^b = \text{block size } a.k.a \text{ line size (in bytes)}\)
- offset\(_b\)
  - b bits

Larger block 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 block size?

Fewer blocks => more conflicts. Can waste bandwidth.
**CPU-Cache Interaction**
(5-stage pipeline)

**Improving Cache Performance**

Average memory access time =  
Hit time + Miss rate x Miss penalty

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

*What is the simplest design strategy?*

*Biggest cache that doesn’t increase hit time past 1-2 cycles*  
(approx 8-32KB in modern technology)  
[design issues more complex with out-of-order superscalar processors]
Serial-versus-Parallel Cache and Memory access

- $\alpha$ is HIT RATIO: Fraction of references in cache
- $1 - \alpha$ is MISS RATIO: Remaining references

Average access time for serial search: $t_{\text{cache}} + (1 - \alpha) t_{\text{mem}}$

Average access time for parallel search: $\alpha t_{\text{cache}} + (1 - \alpha) t_{\text{mem}}$

- Savings are usually small, $t_{\text{mem}} >> t_{\text{cache}}$, hit ratio $\alpha$ high
- High bandwidth required for memory path
- Complexity of handling parallel paths can slow $t_{\text{cache}}$

Causes for Cache Misses

- **Compulsory**: first-reference to a block 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 block-placement strategy
  - misses that would not occur with 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 block size
  + reduces compulsory and capacity (reload) misses
  - increases conflict misses and miss penalty

Write Policy Choices

- Cache hit:
  - write through: write both cache & memory
    » generally higher traffic but simplifies cache coherence
  - write back: write cache only
    (memory is written only when the entry is evicted)
    » a dirty bit per block can further reduce the traffic

- 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

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 Store Data

Delayed Write Addr. Delayed Write Data

Tags Data

Load/Store Hit? Load Data to CPU

Data from a store hit written into data portion of cache during tag access of subsequent store
Write Buffer to Reduce Read Miss Penalty

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

**Faster scheme:** 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

Block-level Optimizations

- Tags are too large, i.e., too much overhead
  - Simple solution: Larger blocks, but miss penalty could be large.
- Sub-block placement (aka sector cache)
  - A valid bit added to units smaller than full block, called sub-blocks
  - Only read a sub-block on a miss
  - *If a tag matches, is the word in the cache?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Set-Associative RAM-Tag Cache

- Not energy-efficient
  - A tag and data word is read from every way
- Two-phase approach
  - First read tags, then just read data from selected way
  - More energy-efficient
  - Doubles latency in L1
  - OK, for L2 and above, why?

Multilevel Caches

- A memory cannot be large and fast
- 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
Presence of L2 influences L1 design

- Use smaller L1 if there is also L2
  - Trade increased L1 miss rate for reduced L1 hit time and reduced 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)
**Inclusion Policy**

- **Inclusive multilevel cache:**
  - Inner cache holds copies of data in outer cache
  - External access need only check outer cache
  - Most common case

- **Exclusive multilevel caches:**
  - Inner cache may hold data 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
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