inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs61c

UC Berkeley CS61C : Machine Structures

Lecture 33 – Caches III

2007-04-11

Lecturer SOE Dan Garcia

www.cs.berkeley.edu/~ddgarcia

Future of movies is 3D? ⇒

Dreamworks says they may exclusively release movies in this format. It's based on circular polarization. I recently saw "Meet the Robinsons" in 3D, and I wouldn't do it again. Eyestrain, headache, and screen too dim!

www.cnn.com/2007/TECH/fun.games/04/09/3d.movies.ap/

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disney_Digital_3-D

Review…

- Mechanism for transparent movement of data among levels of a storage hierarchy
  - set of address/value bindings
  - address ⇒ index to set of candidates
  - compare desired address with tag
  - service hit or miss
    - load new block and binding on miss



What to do on a write hit?

- Write-through
  - update the word in cache block and corresponding word in memory
- Write-back
  - update word in cache block
  - allow memory word to be "stale"

⇒ add 'dirty' bit to each block indicating that memory needs to be updated when block is replaced

⇒ OS flushes cache before I/O…

- Performance trade-offs?

Block Size Tradeoff (1/3)

- Benefits of Larger Block Size
  - Spatial Locality: if we access a given word, we're likely to access other nearby words soon
  - Very applicable with Stored-Program Concept: if we execute a given instruction, it's likely that we'll execute the next few as well
  - Works nicely in sequential array accesses too

Block Size Tradeoff (2/3)

- Drawbacks of Larger Block Size
  - Larger block size means larger miss penalty
    - on a miss, takes longer time to load a new block from next level
  - If block size is too big relative to cache size, then there are too few blocks
    - Result: miss rate goes up
- In general, minimize Average Memory Access Time (AMAT)

  = Hit Time
  + Miss Penalty x Miss Rate

Block Size Tradeoff (3/3)

- Hit Time = time to find and retrieve data from current level cache
- Miss Penalty = average time to retrieve data on a current level miss (includes the possibility of misses on successive levels of memory hierarchy)
- Hit Rate = % of requests that are found in current level cache
- Miss Rate = 1 - Hit Rate

Extreme Example: One Big Block



- Cache Size = 4 bytes Block Size = 4 bytes
  - Only ONE entry (row) in the cache!
- If item accessed, likely accessed again soon
  - But unlikely will be accessed again immediately!
- The next access will likely to be a miss again
  - Continually loading data into the cache but discard data (force out) before use it again
  - Nightmare for cache designer: Ping Pong Effect

Block Size Tradeoff Conclusions



Types of Cache Misses (1/2)

- "Three Cs" Model of Misses
- 1st C: Compulsory Misses
  - occur when a program is first started
  - cache does not contain any of that program's data yet, so misses are bound to occur
  - can't be avoided easily, so won't focus on these in this course

Types of Cache Misses (2/2)

- 2nd C: Conflict Misses
  - miss that occurs because two distinct memory addresses map to the same cache location
  - two blocks (which happen to map to the same location) can keep overwriting each other
  - big problem in direct-mapped caches
  - how do we lessen the effect of these?
- Dealing with Conflict Misses
  - Solution 1: Make the cache size bigger
    - Fails at some point
  - Solution 2: Multiple distinct blocks can fit in the same cache Index?

Fully Associative Cache (1/3)

- Memory address fields:
  - Tag: same as before
  - Offset: same as before
  - Index: non-existant
- What does this mean?
  - no "rows": any block can go anywhere in the cache
  - must compare with all tags in entire cache to see if data is there

Fully Associative Cache (2/3)

- Fully Associative Cache (e.g., 32 B block)
  - compare tags in parallel



Fully Associative Cache (3/3)

- Benefit of Fully Assoc Cache
  - No Conflict Misses (since data can go anywhere)
- Drawbacks of Fully Assoc Cache
  - Need hardware comparator for every single entry: if we have a 64KB of data in cache with 4B entries, we need 16K comparators: infeasible

Third Type of Cache Miss

- Capacity Misses
  - miss that occurs because the cache has a limited size
  - miss that would not occur if we increase the size of the cache
  - sketchy definition, so just get the general idea
- This is the primary type of miss for Fully Associative caches.

N-Way Set Associative Cache (1/3)

- Memory address fields:
  - Tag: same as before
  - Offset: same as before
  - Index: points us to the correct "row" (called a set in this case)
- So what's the difference?
  - each set contains multiple blocks
  - once we've found correct set, must compare with all tags in that set to find our data

Associative Cache Example



- Here's a simple 2 way set associative cache.

N-Way Set Associative Cache (2/3)

- Basic Idea
  - cache is direct-mapped w/respect to sets
  - each set is fully associative
  - basically N direct-mapped caches working in parallel: each has its own valid bit and data
- Given memory address:
  - Find correct set using Index value.
  - Compare Tag with all Tag values in the determined set.
  - If a match occurs, hit!, otherwise a miss.
  - Finally, use the offset field as usual to find the desired data within the block.

N-Way Set Associative Cache (3/3)

- What's so great about this?
  - even a 2-way set assoc cache avoids a lot of conflict misses
  - hardware cost isn't that bad: only need N comparators
- In fact, for a cache with M blocks,
  - it's Direct-Mapped if it's 1-way set assoc
  - it's Fully Assoc if it's M-way set assoc
  - so these two are just special cases of the more general set associative design

4-Way Set Associative Cache Circuit



Block Replacement Policy

- Direct-Mapped Cache: index completely specifies position which position a block can go in on a miss
- N-Way Set Assoc: index specifies a set, but block can occupy any position within the set on a miss
- Fully Associative: block can be written into any position
- Question: if we have the choice, where should we write an incoming block?
  - If there are any locations with valid bit off (empty), then usually write the new block into the first one.
  - If all possible locations already have a valid block, we must pick a replacement policy: rule by which we determine which block gets "cached out" on a miss.

Block Replacement Policy: LRU

- LRU (Least Recently Used)
  - Idea: cache out block which has been accessed (read or write) least recently
  - Pro: temporal locality ⇒ recent past use implies likely future use: in fact, this is a very effective policy
  - Con: with 2-way set assoc, easy to keep track (one LRU bit); with 4-way or greater, requires complicated hardware and much time to keep track of this

Block Replacement Example

- We have a 2-way set associative cache with a four word *total* capacity and one word blocks. We perform the following word accesses (ignore bytes for this problem):

  0, 2, 0, 1, 4, 0, 2, 3, 5, 4

  How many hits and how many misses will there be for the LRU block replacement policy?

Block Replacement Example: LRU

- Addresses 0, 2, 0, 1, 4, 0, ...

	loc 0	loc 1
0: miss, bring into set 0 (loc 0)	set 0: 0 lru	set 1:
2: miss, bring into set 0 (loc 1)	set 0: lru 0	2
	set 1:	
0: hit	set 0: 0	lru 2
	set 1:	
1: miss, bring into set 1 (loc 0)	set 0: 0	lru 2
	set 1: 1	lru
4: miss, bring into set 0 (loc 1, replace 2)	set 0: lru 0	4
	set 1: 1	lru
0: hit	set 0: 0	lru 4
	set 1: 1	lru

Big Idea

- How to choose between associativity, block size, replacement & write policy?
- Design against a performance model
  - Minimize: *Average Memory Access Time*
    = Hit Time
    + Miss Penalty x Miss Rate
  - influenced by technology & program behavior
- Create the illusion of a memory that is large, cheap, and fast - on average

How can we improve miss penalty?

Improving Miss Penalty

- When caches first became popular, Miss Penalty ~ 10 processor clock cycles
- Today 2400 MHz Processor (0.4 ns per clock cycle) and 80 ns to go to DRAM ⇒ 200 processor clock cycles!



Solution: another cache between memory and the processor cache: Second Level (L2) Cache

Analyzing Multi-level cache hierarchy



Avg Mem Access Time =
L1 Hit Time + L1 Miss Rate * L1 Miss Penalty

L1 Miss Penalty =
L2 Hit Time + L2 Miss Rate * L2 Miss Penalty

Avg Mem Access Time =
L1 Hit Time + L1 Miss Rate *
(L2 Hit Time + L2 Miss Rate * L2 Miss Penalty)

And in Conclusion…

- We've discussed memory caching in detail. Caching in general shows up over and over in computer systems
  - Filesystem cache
  - Web page cache
  - Game databases / tablebases
  - Software memoization
  - Others?
- Big idea: if something is expensive but we want to do it repeatedly, do it once and cache the result.
- Cache design choices:
  - Write through v. write back
  - size of cache: speed v. capacity
  - direct-mapped v. associative
  - for N-way set assoc: choice of N
  - block replacement policy
  - 2nd level cache?
  - 3rd level cache?
- Use performance model to pick between choices, depending on programs, technology, budget, ...

Bonus slides

- These are extra slides that used to be included in lecture notes, but have been moved to this, the "bonus" area to serve as a supplement.
- The slides will appear in the order they would have in the normal presentation

Bonus

Example

- Assume
  - Hit Time = 1 cycle
  - Miss rate = 5%
  - Miss penalty = 20 cycles
  - Calculate AMAT…
- Avg mem access time
  = 1 + 0.05 x 20
  = 1 + 1 cycles
  = 2 cycles

Ways to reduce miss rate

- Larger cache
  - limited by cost and technology
  - hit time of first level cache < cycle time (bigger caches are slower)
- More places in the cache to put each block of memory – associativity
  - fully-associative
    - any block any line
  - N-way set associated
    - N places for each block
    - direct map: N=1

Typical Scale

- L1
  - size: tens of KB
  - hit time: complete in one clock cycle
  - miss rates: 1-5%
- L2:
  - size: hundreds of KB
  - hit time: few clock cycles
  - miss rates: 10-20%
- L2 miss rate is fraction of L1 misses that also miss in L2
  - why so high?

Example: with L2 cache

- Assume
  - L1 Hit Time = 1 cycle
  - L1 Miss rate = 5%
  - L2 Hit Time = 5 cycles
  - L2 Miss rate = 15% (% L1 misses that miss)
  - L2 Miss Penalty = 200 cycles
- L1 miss penalty = 5 + 0.15 * 200 = 35
- Avg mem access time = 1 + 0.05 x 35
  = 2.75 cycles

Example: without L2 cache

- Assume
  - L1 Hit Time = 1 cycle
  - L1 Miss rate = 5%
  - L1 Miss Penalty = 200 cycles
- Avg mem access time = 1 + 0.05 x 200
  = 11 cycles
- 4x faster with L2 cache! (2.75 vs. 11)

An actual CPU – Early PowerPC

- Cache
  - 32 KByte Instructions and 32 KByte Data L1 caches
  - External L2 Cache interface with integrated controller and cache tags, supports up to 1 MByte external L2 cache
  - Dual Memory Management Units (MMU) with Translation Lookaside Buffers (TLB)
- Pipelining
  - Superscalar (3 inst/cycle)
  - 6 execution units (2 integer and 1 double precision IEEE floating point)



An Actual CPU – Pentium M



Peer Instructions

1. In the last 10 years, the gap between the access time of DRAMs & the cycle time of processors has decreased. (I.e., is closing)
2. A 2-way set-associative cache can be outperformed by a direct-mapped cache.
3. Larger block size ⇒ lower miss rate

	ABC
0:	FFF
1:	FFT
2:	FTF
3:	FTT
4:	TFF
5:	TFT
6:	TTF
7:	TTT