# Lecture 18

- Review:
  - Write-through?
  - Write-back?
- Block allocation policy on a write miss
- Cache performance

Write-through caches

- A write-through cache forces all writes to update both the cache *and* the main memory.

Mem[214] = 21763

Index	V	Tag	Data
…			
110	1	11010	21763
…			

Address	Data
…	
1101 0110	21763
…	

- This is simple to implement and keeps the cache and memory consistent.
- The bad thing is that forcing every write to go to main memory, we use up bandwidth between the cache and the memory.

Write-back caches

- In a write-back cache, the memory is not updated until the cache block needs to be replaced (*e.g.*, when loading data into a full cache set).
- For example, we might write some data to the cache at first, leaving it inconsistent with the main memory as shown before.
  - The cache block is marked "dirty" to indicate this inconsistency

Mem[214] = 21763

Index	V	Dirty	Tag	Data
…				
110	1	1	11010	21763
…				

Address	Data
1000 1110	1225
1101 0110	42803
…	

- Subsequent reads to the same memory address?
- Multiple writes to same block?

Write-back cache discussion

- The advantage of write-back caches is that not all write operations need to access main memory, as with write-through caches.
  - If a single address is frequently written to, then it doesn't pay to keep writing that data through to main memory.
  - If several bytes within the same cache block are modified, they will only force one memory write operation at write-back time.

Write misses

- A second scenario is if we try to write to an address that is not already contained in the cache; this is called a write miss.
- Let's say we want to store 21763 into Mem[1101 0110] but we find that address is not currently in the cache.

Index	V	Tag	Data
…			
110	1	00010	123456
…			

Address	Data
…	
1101 0110	6378
…	

- When we update Mem[1101 0110], should we *also* load it into the cache?

Write around caches (a.k.a. write-no-allocate)

- With a write around policy, the write operation goes directly to main memory *without* affecting the cache.

Mem[214] = 21763

Index	V	Tag	Data
...			
110	1	00010	123456
...			

Address	Data
...	
1101 0110	21763
...	

Write around caches (a.k.a. write-no-allocate)

- With a write around policy, the write operation goes directly to main memory *without* affecting the cache.

Mem[214] = 21763

Index	V	Tag	Data
...			
110	1	00010	123456
...			

Address	Data
...	
1101 0110	21763
...	

- This is good when data is written but not immediately used again, in which case there's no point to load it into the cache yet.

```
for (int i = 0; i < SIZE; i++)
    a[i] = i;
```

Allocate on write

- An allocate on write strategy would instead load the newly written data into the cache.

Mem[214] = 21763

Index	V	Tag	Data
...			
110	1	11010	21763
...			

Address	Data
...	
1101 0110	21763
...	

- If that data is needed again soon, it will be available in the cache.

Which is it?

- Given the following trace of accesses, can you determine whether the cache is write-allocate or write-no-allocate?
  - Assume A and B are distinct, and can be in the cache simultaneously.

Miss	Load A
Miss	Store B
Hit	Store A
Hit	Load A
Miss	Load B
Hit	Load B
Hit	Load A

Which is it?

- Given the following trace of accesses, can you determine whether the cache is write-allocate or write-no-allocate?
  - Assume A and B are distinct, and can be in the cache simultaneously.

Miss	Load A
Miss	Store B
Hit	Store A
Hit	Load A
Miss	Load B
Hit	Load B
Hit	Load A

Answer: Write-no-allocate

On a write-allocate cache this would be a hit

# First Observations

- **Split Instruction/Data caches:**
  — Pro: No structural hazard between IF & MEM stages
  - A single-ported unified cache stalls fetch during load or store
  — Con: Static partitioning of cache between instructions & data
  - Bad if working sets unequal: *e.g.*, code/**DATA** or **CODE**/data

- **Cache Hierarchies:**
  — Trade-off between access time & hit rate
  - L1 cache can focus on fast access time (okay hit rate)
  - L2 cache can focus on good hit rate (okay access time)
 — Such hierarchical design is another "big idea"
  — We'll see this in section.

```
┌───────┐     ┌──────────┐     ┌──────────┐     ┌──────────┐
│  CPU  │◄───►│ L1 cache │◄───►│ L2 cache │◄───►│   Main   │
└───────┘     └──────────┘     └──────────┘     │  Memory  │
                                                 └──────────┘
```

Opteron Vital Statistics

```
┌─────────┐   ┌────────────┐   ┌────────────┐   ┌────────────┐
│   CPU   │◄─►│  L1 cache  │◄─►│  L2 cache  │◄─►│    Main    │
└─────────┘   └────────────┘   └────────────┘   │   Memory   │
                                                 └────────────┘
```

- L1 Caches: Instruction & Data
  - 64 kB
  - 64 byte blocks
  - 2-way set associative
  - 2 cycle access time

- L2 Cache:
  - 1 MB
  - 64 byte blocks
  - 4-way set associative
  - 16 cycle access time (total, not just miss penalty)

- Memory
  - 200+ cycle access time

Comparing cache organizations

- Like many architectural features, caches are evaluated experimentally.
  - As always, performance depends on the actual instruction mix, since different programs will have different memory access patterns.
  - Simulating or executing real applications is the most accurate way to measure performance characteristics.
- The graphs on the next few slides illustrate the simulated miss rates for several different cache designs.
  - Again lower miss rates are generally better, but remember that the miss rate is just one component of average memory access time and execution time.
  - You'll probably do some cache simulations if you take CS433.

Associativity tradeoffs and miss rates

- As we saw last time, higher associativity means more complex hardware.
- But a highly-associative cache will also exhibit a lower miss rate.
  - Each set has more blocks, so there's less chance of a conflict between two addresses which both belong in the same set.
  - Overall, this will reduce AMAT and memory stall cycles.
- The textbook shows the miss rates decreasing as the associativity increases.

Cache size and miss rates

- The cache size also has a significant impact on performance.
  - The larger a cache is, the less chance there will be of a conflict.
  - Again this means the miss rate decreases, so the AMAT and number of memory stall cycles also decrease.
- The complete Figure 7.29 depicts the miss rate as a function of both the cache size and its associativity.

Block size and miss rates

- Finally, Figure 7.12 on p. 559 shows miss rates relative to the block size and overall cache size.
  - Smaller blocks do not take maximum advantage of spatial locality.

Memory and overall performance

- How do cache hits and misses affect overall system performance?
  - Assuming a hit time of one CPU clock cycle, program execution will continue normally on a cache hit. (Our earlier computations always assumed one clock cycle for an instruction fetch or data access.)
  - For cache misses, we'll assume the CPU must stall to wait for a load from main memory.
- The total number of stall cycles depends on the number of cache misses *and* the miss penalty.

  Memory stall cycles = Memory accesses x miss rate x miss penalty

- To include stalls due to cache misses in CPU performance equations, we have to add them to the "base" number of execution cycles.

  CPU time = (CPU execution cycles + Memory stall cycles) x Cycle time

Performance example

- Assume that 33% of the instructions in a program are data accesses. The cache hit ratio is 97% and the hit time is one cycle, but the miss penalty is 20 cycles.

Memory stall cycles = Memory accesses x Miss rate x Miss penalty
= 0.33 I x 0.03 x 20 cycles
= 0.2 I cycles

- If I instructions are executed, then the number of wasted cycles will be 0.2 x I.

This code is 1.2 times slower than a program with a "perfect" CPI of 1!

Memory systems are a bottleneck

CPU time = (CPU execution cycles + Memory stall cycles) x Cycle time

- Processor performance traditionally outpaces memory performance, so the memory system is often the system bottleneck.
- For example, with a base CPI of 1, the CPU time from the last page is:

CPU time = (I + 0.2 I) x Cycle time

- What if we could *double* the CPU performance so the CPI becomes 0.5, but memory performance remained the same?

CPU time = (0.5 I + 0.2 I) x Cycle time

- The overall CPU time improves by just 1.2/0.7 = 1.7 times!
- Refer back to Amdahl's Law from textbook page 101.
  - Speeding up only part of a system has diminishing returns.

Basic main memory design

- There are some ways the main memory can be organized to reduce miss penalties and help with caching.

- For some concrete examples, let's assume the following three steps are taken when a cache needs to load data from the main memory.

  1. It takes 1 cycle to send an address to the RAM.

  2. There is a 15-cycle latency for each RAM access.

  3. It takes 1 cycle to return data from the RAM.

- In the setup shown here, the buses from the CPU to the cache and from the cache to RAM are all one word wide.

- If the cache has one-word blocks, then filling a block from RAM (*i.e.*, the miss penalty) would take 17 cycles.

  1 + 15 + 1 = 17 clock cycles

- The cache controller has to send the desired address to the RAM, wait and receive the data.

CPU

Cache

Main Memory

Miss penalties for larger cache blocks

- If the cache has four-word blocks, then loading a single block would need four individual main memory accesses, and a miss penalty of 68 cycles!

4 x (1 + 15 + 1) = 68 clock cycles

A wider memory

- A simple way to decrease the miss penalty is to widen the memory and its interface to the cache, so we can read multiple words from RAM in one shot.

- If we could read four words from the memory at once, a four-word cache load would need just 17 cycles.

  1 + 15 + 1 = 17 cycles

- The disadvantage is the cost of the wider buses—each additional bit of memory width requires another connection to the cache.

An interleaved memory

- Another approach is to interleave the memory, or split it into "banks" that can be accessed individually.

- The main benefit is overlapping the latencies of accessing each word.

- For example, if our main memory has four banks, each one byte wide, then we could load four bytes into a cache block in just 20 cycles.

  1 + 15 + (4 x 1) = 20 cycles

- Our buses are still one byte wide here, so four cycles are needed to transfer data to the caches.

- This is cheaper than implementing a four-byte bus, but not too much slower.

CPU

Cache

Main Memory

| Bank 0 | Bank 1 | Bank 2 | Bank 3 |

Interleaved memory accesses

Clock cycles

Load word 1
Load word 2
Load word 3
Load word 4

15 cycles

- Here is a diagram to show how the memory accesses can be interleaved.
  — The magenta cycles represent sending an address to a memory bank.
  — Each memory bank has a 15-cycle latency, and it takes another cycle (shown in blue) to return data from the memory.
- This is the same basic idea as pipelining!
  — As soon as we request data from one memory bank, we can go ahead and request data from another bank as well.
  — Each individual load takes 17 clock cycles, but four overlapped loads require just 20 cycles.

Which is better?

- Increasing block size can improve hit rate (due to spatial locality), but transfer time increases. Which cache configuration would be better?

	Cache #1	Cache #2
Block size	32-bytes	64-bytes
Miss rate	5%	4%

- Assume both caches have single cycle hit times. Memory accesses take 15 cycles, and the memory bus is 8-bytes wide:
  - i.e., an 16-byte memory access takes 18 cycles:

    1 (send address) + 15 (memory access) + 2 (two 8-byte transfers)

recall: AMAT = Hit time + (Miss rate x Miss penalty)

Which is better?

- Increasing block size can improve hit rate (due to spatial locality), but transfer time increases. Which cache configuration would be better?

	Cache #1	Cache #2
Block size	32-bytes	64-bytes
Miss rate	5%	4%

- Assume both caches have single cycle hit times. Memory accesses take 15 cycles, and the memory bus is 8-bytes wide:
  - i.e., an 16-byte memory access takes 18 cycles:

  1 (send address) + 15 (memory access) + 2 (two 8-byte transfers)

Cache #1:
Miss Penalty = 1 + 15 + 32B/8B = 20 cycles
AMAT = 1 + (.05 * 20) = 2

Cache #2:
Miss Penalty = 1 + 15 + 64B/8B = 24 cycles
AMAT = 1 + (.04 * 24) = ~1.96

recall: AMAT = Hit time + (Miss rate x Miss penalty)

Summary

- Writing to a cache poses a couple of interesting issues.
  - Write-through and write-back policies keep the cache consistent with main memory in different ways for write hits.
  - Write-around and allocate-on-write are two strategies to handle write misses, differing in whether updated data is loaded into the cache.
- Memory system performance depends upon the cache hit time, miss rate and miss penalty, as well as the actual program being executed.
  - We can use these numbers to find the average memory access time.
  - We can also revise our CPU time formula to include stall cycles.

AMAT = Hit time + (Miss rate x Miss penalty)

Memory stall cycles = Memory accesses x miss rate x miss penalty

CPU time = (CPU execution cycles + Memory stall cycles) x Cycle time

- The organization of a memory system affects its performance.
  - The cache size, block size, and associativity affect the miss rate.
  - We can organize the main memory to help reduce miss penalties. For example, interleaved memory supports pipelined data accesses.

Writing Cache Friendly Code

- Two major rules:
- Repeated references to data are good (temporal locality)
- Stride-1 reference patterns are good (spatial locality)
- Example: cold cache, 4-byte words, 4-word cache blocks

```
int sum_array_rows(int a[M][N])
{
  int i, j, sum = 0;

  for (i = 0; i < M; i++)
     for (j = 0; j < N; j++)
        sum += a[i][j];
  return sum;
}
```

```
int sum_array_cols(int a[M][N])
{
  int i, j, sum = 0;

  for (j = 0; j < N; j++)
     for (i = 0; i < M; i++)
        sum += a[i][j];
  return sum;
}
```

Miss rate = 1/4 = 25%   Miss rate = 100%

Adapted from Randy Bryant