

CS 61C: Great Ideas in Computer Architecture (Machine Structures) Caches Part 1

Instructors:

John Wawrzynek & Vladimir Stojanovic

<http://inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs61c/>

New-School Machine Structures (It's a bit more complicated!)

Software

Hardware

- Parallel Requests
Assigned to computer
e.g., Search "Katz"
- Parallel Threads
Assigned to core
e.g., Lookup, Ads
- Parallel Instructions
>1 instruction @ one time
e.g., 5 pipelined instructions
- Parallel Data
>1 data item @ one time
e.g., Add of 4 pairs of words
- Hardware descriptions
All gates @ one time
- Programming Languages


*Harness
Parallelism &
Achieve High
Performance*

Warehouse
Scale
Computer


How do
we know?



Smart
Phone



Components of a Computer




Problem: Large memories slow?

Library Analogy

- Finding a book in a large library takes time
 - Takes time to search a large card catalog – (mapping title/author to index number)
 - Round-trip time to walk to the stacks and retrieve the desired book.
- Larger libraries makes both delays worse
- Electronic memories have the same issue, *plus* the technologies that we use to store an individual bit get slower as we increase density (SRAM versus DRAM versus Magnetic Disk)

However what we want is a large yet fast memory!

Processor-DRAM Gap (latency)



1980 microprocessor executes ~one instruction in same time as DRAM access
2015 microprocessor executes ~1000 instructions in same time as DRAM access


Slow DRAM access could have disastrous impact on CPU performance!

What to do: Library Analogy

- Want to write a report using library books
 - E.g., works of J.D. Salinger
- Go to Doe library, look up relevant books, fetch from stacks, and place on desk in library
- If need more, check them out and keep on desk
 - But don't return earlier books since might need them
- You hope this collection of ~10 books on desk enough to write report, despite 10 being only 0.00001% of books in UC Berkeley libraries


Big Idea: Memory Hierarchy

Processor



As we move to outer levels the latency goes up and price per bit goes down. Why?

Real Memory Reference Patterns




Donald J. Hatfield, Jeanette Gerald: Program Restructuring for Virtual Memory. IBM Systems Journal 10(3): 168-192 (1971)

Big Idea: Locality

- *Temporal Locality* (locality in time)
 - Go back to same book on desktop multiple times
 - If a memory location is referenced, then it will tend to be referenced again soon
- *Spatial Locality* (locality in space)
 - When go to book shelf, pick up multiple books on J.D. Salinger since library stores related books together
 - If a memory location is referenced, the locations with nearby addresses will tend to be referenced soon

Memory Reference Patterns

Memory Address (one dot per access)




Donald J. Hatfield, Jeanette Gerald: Program Restructuring for Virtual Memory. IBM Systems Journal 10(3): 168-192 (1971)

Principle of Locality

- *Principle of Locality*: Programs access small portion of address space at any instant of time (spatial locality) and repeatedly access that portion (temporal locality)
- What program structures lead to **temporal** and **spatial locality** in instruction accesses?
- In data accesses?

Memory Reference Patterns




Cache Philosophy

- Programmer-invisible hardware mechanism to give illusion of speed of fastest memory with size of largest memory
 - Works fine even if programmer has no idea what a cache is
 - However, performance-oriented programmers today sometimes “reverse engineer” cache design to design data structures to match cache
 - We’ll do that in Project 3

Memory Access without Cache

- Load word instruction: `lw $t0, 0($t1)`
- `$t1` contains 1022_{ten} , `Memory[1022] = 99`
 1. Processor issues address 1022_{ten} to Memory
 2. Memory reads word at address 1022_{ten} (99)
 3. Memory sends 99 to Processor
 4. Processor loads 99 into register `$t0`

Adding Cache to Computer




Memory Access with Cache

- Load word instruction: `lw $t0, 0($t1)`
- `$t1` contains 1022_{ten} , `Memory[1022] = 99`
- With cache: Processor issues address 1022_{ten} to Cache
 1. Cache checks to see if has copy of data at address 1022_{ten}
 - 2a. If finds a match (Hit): cache reads 99, sends to processor
 - 2b. No match (Miss): cache sends address 1022 to Memory
 - I. Memory reads 99 at address 1022_{ten}
 - II. Memory sends 99 to Cache
 - III. Cache replaces word with new 99
 - IV. Cache sends 99 to processor
 2. Processor loads 99 into register `$t0`

Administrivia


- HW2 due 10/16 @ 23:59:59
- Project 3-1 due date now 10/21 – already released, *start early*
- Project 3-2 due date now 10/28 (release 10/18)
- Midterm 1:
 - grades posted today
 - Stats, next slide

Version A



MINIMUM	MEDIAN	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD DEV
15.5	56.0	86.5	54.87	14.68

Version B



MINIMUM	MEDIAN	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD DEV
14.0	55.0	90.0	54.75	15.2

Cache “Tags”

- Need way to tell if have copy of location in memory so that can decide on hit or miss
- On cache miss, put memory address of block in “tag address” of cache block


1022 placed in tag next to data from memory (99)

Tag	Data
252	12
1022	99
131	7
2041	20

From earlier instructions

Anatomy of a 16 Byte Cache, 4 Byte Block

- Operations:
 1. Cache Hit
 2. Cache Miss
 3. Refill cache from memory
- Cache needs Address Tags to decide if Processor Address is a Cache Hit or Cache Miss
 - Compares all 4 tags



Cache Replacement

- Suppose processor now requests location 511, which contains 11?
- Doesn't match any cache block, so must "evict" one resident block to make room
 - Which block to evict?
- Replace "victim" with new memory block at address 511


Tag	Data
252	12
1022	99
511	11
2041	20

Block Must be Aligned in Memory

- Word blocks are aligned, so binary address of all words in cache always ends in 00_{two}
 - How to take advantage of this to save hardware and energy?
 - Don't need to compare last 2 bits of 32-bit byte address (comparator can be narrower)
- => Don't need to store last 2 bits of 32-bit byte address in Cache Tag (Tag can be narrower)


Anatomy of a 32B Cache, 8B Block

- Blocks must be aligned in pairs, otherwise could get same word twice in cache
- ⇒ Tags only have even-numbered words
- ⇒ Last 3 bits of address always 000_{two}
- ⇒ Tags, comparators can be narrower
- Can get hit for either word in block




Hardware Cost of Cache

- Need to compare every tag to the Processor address
- Comparators are expensive
- Optimization: use 2 “sets” of data with a total of only 2 comparators
- 1 Address bit selects which set
- Compare only tags from selected set
- Generalize to more sets



Processor Address Fields used by Cache Controller


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




- Size of Index = \log_2 (number of sets)
- Size of Tag = Address size – Size of Index – \log_2 (number of bytes/block)

What is limit to number of sets?

- For a given total number of blocks, we can save more comparators if have more than 2 sets
- Limit: As Many Sets as Cache Blocks => only one block per set – only needs one comparator!
- Called “Direct-Mapped” Design



Direct Mapped Cache Ex: Mapping a 6-bit Memory Address




- In example, block size is 4 bytes/1 word
- Memory and cache blocks always the same size, unit of transfer between memory and cache
- # Memory blocks >> # Cache blocks
 - 16 Memory blocks = 16 words = 64 bytes => 6 bits to address all bytes
 - 4 Cache blocks, 4 bytes (1 word) per block
 - 4 Memory blocks map to each cache block
- Memory block to cache block, aka *index*: middle two bits
- Which memory block is in a given cache block, aka *tag*: top two bits

One More Detail: Valid Bit


- When start a new program, cache does not have valid information for this program
- Need an indicator whether this tag entry is valid for this program
- Add a “valid bit” to the cache tag entry
 - 0 => cache miss, even if by chance, address = tag
 - 1 => cache hit, if processor address = tag

Caching: A Simple First Example



Direct-Mapped Cache Example


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



What kind of locality are we taking advantage of?

Multiword-Block Direct-Mapped Cache

- Four words/block, cache size = 1K words



What kind of locality are we taking advantage of?

Cache Names for Each Organization

- “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: $N = \text{number of blocks}$**
 - **Direct Mapped: $N = 1$**

Range of Set-Associative Caches

- For a fixed-size cache, and a given block size, each increase by a factor of 2 in associativity doubles the number of blocks per set (i.e., the number of “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 bit

More Associativity (more ways)



What if we can also change the block size?

Clickers/Peer Instruction

- For a cache with constant total capacity, if we increase the number of ways by a factor of 2, which statement is false:
- A: The number of sets could be doubled
- B: The tag width could decrease
- C: The block size could stay the same
- D: The block size could be halved
- E: Tag width must increase

Total Cash Capacity =

Associativity * # of sets * block_size

*Bytes = blocks/set * sets * Bytes/block*

$$C = N * S * B$$




$$\begin{aligned} \text{address_size} &= \text{tag_size} + \text{index_size} + \text{offset_size} \\ &= \text{tag_size} + \log_2(S) + \log_2(B) \end{aligned}$$

Clicker Question: C remains constant, S and/or B can change such that

$$C = 2N * (SB)' \Rightarrow (SB)' = SB/2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tag_size} &= \text{address_size} - (\log_2(S) + \log_2(B)) = \text{address_size} - \log_2(SB) \\ &= \text{address_size} - (\log_2(SB) - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Typical Memory Hierarchy




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

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

And In Conclusion, ...

- Principle of Locality for Libraries /Computer Memory
- Hierarchy of Memories (speed/size/cost per bit) to Exploit Locality
- Cache – copy of data lower level in memory hierarchy
- Direct Mapped to find block in cache using Tag field and Valid bit for Hit
- Cache design choice:
 - Write-Through vs. Write-Back