# 18-447 Lecture 16: Cache Design in Context (Uniprocessor)

James C. Hoe
Department of ECE
Carnegie Mellon University

# Midterm Class Distribution




| Minimum | Median | Maximum | Mean | Std Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16.0 | 51.5 | 81.5 | 51.99 | 17.28 |

# Midterm Summary Statistics

| | 1:jump | 2:pareto | 3:spdup | 4:hzrd | 5:BP | 6:ucode | 7:pwr | 8:assmb | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| possible | 8 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 90 |
| average | **4.2** | **3.3** | **2.9** | **7.8** | **7.4** | **10.6** | **8.0** | **7.4** | **52.0** |
| stdev | **2.2** | **3.1** | **3.1** | **4.8** | **3.8** | **2.6** | **4.1** | **3.8** | **17.3** |
| max | **8** | **8** | **10** | **15** | **12** | **12** | **13** | **12** | **81.5** |
| median | **4** | **4** | **5** | **8** | **6** | **12** | **8** | **9** | **51.5** |
| min | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **3** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **16** |

# Housekeeping

- Your goal today
  - understand cache design and operation in context
  - focus on uniprocessor for now
- Notices
  - HW 4, due 4/10 (Handout #13)
  - Lab 3, due this week
  - Midterm regrade due Monday 4/10 noon

***Follow Canvas instructions carefully!!***

- Readings
  - P&H Ch 5

# M=$2^{32}$, a=2, C=1K, B=4, G=2: "textbook" solution



# Same cache parameters
# but tune for "narrower" data SRAM banks




Can you make the tag SRAMs taller/narrower also?

# Same cache parameters but tune for "fatter" data SRAM banks




Can you make the tag SRAMs shorter/wider also?

# Same cache parameters but each block frame is interleaved over 2 SRAM banks



# The Cache and You
# (simple, single core from Lab)

# The Context




[Based on original figure from P&H CO&D, COPYRIGHT 2004 Elsevier. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

# Programmer-Visible State
## (aka Architectural State)




*think interfaces not modules*

Recall

**Based on original figure from [P&H CO&D, COPYRIGHT 2004 Elsevier. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

# Adding Caches to In-order Pipeline

- On I-fetch and LW assuming 1-cyc SRAM lookup
  - if hit, just like magic memory
  - if miss, stall pipeline until cache ready
- On SW also assuming 1-cycle SRAM lookup
  - if miss, stall pipeline until cache ready (must we??)
  - if hit, ???. . .
- For SW, need to check tag array to ascertain hit before committing to write data array
  - data array write happens in the next cycle
  - if SW is followed immediately by LW

    $\Rightarrow$ **structural hazard on data array** $\Rightarrow$ **stall, *whom?***

# Store Buffer

- Why stall when memory port is usually free?
- After tag array hit, buffer SW address and data until next free data array cycle (not used by LW)
  - younger LW keep going (reorder w. buffered SW)
  - must ensure buffered SW's target block not evicted
- Memory dependence and forwarding
  - younger LW must check against pending SW-addresses in store buffer (CAM) for RAW dependence



# Must wait for a miss? (uniprocessor)

- In-order pipeline must stall for LW-miss
- Younger instructions can move ahead of SW-miss
  - except LW to same address; if so, stall or forward
  - additional SW-misses to same and different addr's can be "completed" from pipeline's view
- Modern out-of-order execution supports non-blocking miss handling for both LW and SW
  - too expensive to stall (CPU/memory speed gap)
  - significant complexity in
    - detecting and resolving memory dependencies
    - constructing precise exception state

# Details and more details when building a cache for real

# Basic Operation
# Ans (1): demand-driven




Recall

# Write-Through Cache

- On write-hit in $L_i$, should $L_{i+1}$ be updated?
- If yes, $L_i$ is write-through
  - simple management (discard on replacement)
  - external agents (DMA and other proc's) see up-to-date values in $L_{i+1}$ (e.g., DRAM)
- With write-through, on a write-miss, should a cache block be allocated in $L_i$ (aka write-allocate)?

---

- Write-through to DRAM not viable today

  3.0GHz, IPC=2, 10% SW, ~8byte/SW $\Rightarrow$ ~5GB/s/core

  L1 (w. parity) write-through to L2 (w. ECC) is in use

# Write-Back Cache

- Hold changes in $L_i$ until block is displaced to $L_{i+1}$
  - on read or write miss, entire block is brought into $L_i$
  - LWs and SWs hit in $L_i$ until replacement
  - on replacement, $L_i$ copy written back out to $L_{i+1}$

    adds latency to load miss stall
- "Dirty" bit optimization
  - keep per-block status bit to track if a block has been modified since brought into $L_i$
  - if not dirty, no write-back on replacement
- What if a DMA device wants to read a DRAM location with a dirty cached copy?

  How to find out? How to access?

# Write-Back Cache and DMA

- DRAM not always up-to-date if write-back
- DMA should see up-to-date value (aka, cache coherent)
- Option 1: SW flushes whole cache or specific blocks before programming DMA
- Option 2: cache monitors bus for external requests
  - ask request to a dirty location to "retry"
  - write out dirty copy before request is repeated

snoop



# Idempotency and Side-effects

- Loading from real memory location M[A] should return most recent value stored to M[A]
  - ⇒ writing M[A] once is the same as writing M[A] with same value multiple times in a row
  - ⇒ reading M[A] multiple times returns same value

  This is why memory caching works!!
- LW/SW to mmap locations can have side-effects
  - reading/writing mmap location can imply commands and other state changes
  - e.g., a mmap device that is a FIFO
    - SW to 0xffff0000 pushes value
    - LW from 0xffff0000 returns popped value




What happens if 0xffff0000 is cached?

Recall

# Programmer-Visible State
## (aka Architectural State)




*think interfaces not modules*

Recall

**Based on original figure from [P&H CO&D, COPYRIGHT 2004 Elsevier. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

# Harvard vs Princeton Architecture

- Historically
  - "Harvard" referred to Aiken's Mark series with separate instruction and data memory
  - "Princeton" referred to von Neumann's unified instruction and data memory
- Contemporary usage: split vs unified "caches"
- L1 I/D caches commonly split and asymmetrical
  - double bandwidth and no-cross pollution on disjoint I and D footprints
  - I-fetch smaller footprint, high-spatial locality and read-only $\Rightarrow$ I-cache smaller, simpler

    what about self-modifying code?
- L2 and L3 are unified for simplicity

# Multi-Level Caches




On-chip or off-chip?

- a few pclk latency
- many GB/sec on random word accesses

Intermediate cache levels bridge latency and bandwidth gap between L1 and DRAM

- hundreds of pclk latency
- ~GB/sec on sequential block accesses

# aBC of Multi-Level Cache Design

- Upper-level caches (L1)
  - small **C**: upper-bound by SRAM access time
  - smallish **B**: upper-bound by **C/B** effects
  - **a**: required to counter **C/B** effects
- Lower-level caches (L2, L3, etc.)
  - large **C**: upper-bound by chip area
  - large **B**: to reduce tag storage overhead
  - **a**: upper bound by complexity and speed
- New very large (10s MB) on-chip caches on are distributed structures
  - same basic notions of ways and sets
  - but they don't look or operate anything like "textbook"

# Modern Last-Level Cache (LLC)







[https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/intel-xeon-processor-scalable-family-technical-overview]

- Disaggregated, asynchronous structure; shared by all cores within a socket
- Hold, fast "coherent" copies of local and remote DRAM locations

Departure from classic uniproc. hierarchy

# Inclusion Principle

- Classically, $L_i$ contents is always a subset of $L_{i+1}$
  - if an address is important enough to be in $L_i$, it must be important enough to be in $L_{i+1}$
  - external agents (DMA and other proc's) only have to check the lowest level to know if an address is cached—do not need to consume L1 bandwidth
- Inclusion no longer taken as a given
  - nontrivial to maintain if $L_{i+1}$ has lower associativity
  - too much redundant capacity in multicore with many per-core $L_i$ and shared $L_{i+1}$
  - Last-level cache "directories" track cached addr

# Inclusion Violation Example




x,y,z have same L1 idx bits
y,z have the same L2 idx bits
x,{y,z} have different L2 idx bits

# Aside: Victim "Cache"

- High-associativity is an expensive solution to avoid conflicts in a few sets only
- Augment a low-associative main cache with a very small but fully associative victim cache
  - blocks evicted from main cache is first held in victim cache
  - if an evicted block is referenced again soon, it is returned to main cache
  - if an evicted block doesn't get referenced again, it will eventually be displaced from victim cache to next level

Plays a different role outside of standard memory hierarchy stacking

# Aside: Software-Assists

- Separate "temporal" vs "non-temporal" hierarchy
  - exposed in the ISA (e.g., Intel IA64 below)
  - load and store instructions include **hints** about where to cache on a cache miss
  - **"hint"** only so implementation could support a subset or none of the levels and actions



# Test yourself

Optional Reading: “Measuring Cache and TLB Performance and Their Effect on Benchmark Run Times,” Saavedra and Smith, 1995.

# What cache is in your computer?

- How to figure out what cache configuration is in your computer
  - capacity (**C**), associativity (**a**), and block-size (**B**)
  - number of levels
- The presence or lack of a cache should not be detectable by functional behavior of software
- But you could tell if you measured execution time to infer the number of cache misses

# Capacity Experiment: assume 2-power C

- For increasing Range = 1,2,4,8,16,…
  - allocate a buffer of size R
  - repeatedly {read every byte in buffer in sequence}
  - measure average read time in steadystate
- Analysis
  - for small R≤C, expect all reads to hit
  - for large R>C, expect reads to miss and detect corresponding jump in average memory access time
- If continuing to increase R, read time jumps again when buffer size spills out to next cache level

Warning: timing won't be perfect when you try this

# Block Size Experiment: knowing C

- Allocate a buffer of size **R** >> **C**
- For increasing **S**=1,2,4,8….,
  - repeatedly {read every **S**'th byte in buffer in sequence}
  - measure average read time in steadystate
- Analysis
  - since **R**>>**C**, expect first read to a block to miss when revisiting a block
  - reads to same block in same round should hit
  - expect increasing average read time for increasing **S** until **S**≥**B** (no reuse in block)

# Associativity Experiment: knowing C

- For increasing **R**, where **R** is a multiple of **C**
  - allocate a buffer of size **R**
  - repeatedly {read every **C**'th byte in buffer in sequence}
- Analysis
  - all **R**/**C** references map to the same set
  - for small **R** s.t. (**R**/**C**)≤**a**, expect all reads to hit
  - for large **R** s.t. (**R**/**C**)>**a**, expect some reads to miss since touching more addresses than ways

note: 100% cache miss if LRU is used

*How to detect associativity for lower-level caches?*

# Know your cache

- What else can you tell?
  - write-back vs write-through/write-allocate
  - unified vs. split design
  - I-cache C, B, a
  - $t_i$
  - replacement policy of associative caches
- Same mental exercise is required to control cache use in performance tuning

Caveat: experiments may not predict behaviors exactly for modern CPUs with virtual memory, complex hierarchies, and prefetchers