

Hakim Weatherspoon CS 3410, Spring 2012 Computer Science Cornell University

See P&H 5.1, 5.2 (except writes)

Big Picture: Memory

Memory: big & slow vs Caches: small & fast



Goals for Today: caches

Examples of caches:

- Direct Mapped
- Fully Associative
- N-way set associative

Performance and comparison

- Hit ratio (conversly, miss ratio)
- Average memory access time (AMAT)
- Cache size

Cache Performance

Average Memory Access Time (AMAT) Cache Performance (very simplified): L1 (SRAM): 512 x & byte cache lines, direct mapped Data cost: 3 cycle per word access Lookup cost: 2 cycle 16 worde Mem (DRAM): 4GB Data cost: 50 cycle per word, plus 3 cycle per consecutive word AMAT-9/0h, Exhitting + % miss x miss Cost hit = 5 cycles COSE MISS = 2 + 50+16*3 Performance depends on: 5 + 50 + 15 * 3 Accessitime for hit, miss penalty, hit rates = 14.5 cycles 5 + 10

Misses

Cache misses: classification

The line is being referenced for the first time

• Cold (aka Compulsory) Miss

The line was in the cache, but has been evicted

Avoiding Misses

Q: How to avoid...

Cold Misses

- Unavoidable? The data was never in the cache...
- Prefetching!
- **Other Misses**
 - Buy more SRAM
 - Use a more flexible cache design



Misses

Cache misses: classification

The line is being referenced for the first time

- Cold (aka Compulsory) Miss
- The line was in the cache, but has been evicted...
- ... because some other access with the same index
 - Conflict Miss
- ... because the cache is too small
 - i.e. the *working set* of program is larger than the cache
 - Capacity Miss

Avoiding Misses

Q: How to avoid...

Cold Misses

- Unavoidable? The data was never in the cache...
- Prefetching!
- **Capacity Misses**
 - Buy more SRAM
- **Conflict Misses**
 - Use a more flexible cache design

Three common designs

A given data block can be placed...

- ... in any cache line → Fully Associative
- … in exactly one cache line → Direct Mapped
- ... in a small set of cache lines → Set Associative

Comparison: Direct Mapped Using byte addresses in this example! Addr Bus = 5 bits



Comparison: Direct Mapped Using byte addresses in this example! Addr Bus = 5 bits



Comparison: Fully Associative Using byte addresses in this example! Addr Bus = 5 bits



13

Comparison: Fully Associative

Using byte addresses in this example! Addr Bus = 5 bits



Comparison: 2 Way Set Assoc

Using byte addresses in this example! Addr Bus = 5 bits



Comparison: 2 Way Set Assoc Using byte addresses in this example! Addr Bus = 5 bits

Processor	Cache		2 sets			Memory		
			<u>2</u> word b	olock		0	100	
			<u>3</u> DIT Tag	Tield	v field	1	110	
	tag	data	1 bit blo	mae ck of	x neiù feat fiald	2	120	
$LB \ \$1 \leftarrow M[1] M$	8		T DIL DIO		iset neiu	2	120	
$LB \ \$2 \leftarrow M[\ 5 \] \ M$	0		0			5	130	
$LB \ S3 \leftarrow M[1] H$						4	140	
$LB \ 53 \leftarrow V [4] \ H$	0		0			5	150	
$LB \ \$2 \leftarrow M[\ 12 \] M$						6	160	
LB $$2 \leftarrow M[5] M$						7	170	
LB \$2 ← M[12] H						8	180	
$LB \ \$2 \leftarrow M[5] H$						9	190	
$LB \ \$2 \leftarrow M[5] H$						10	200	
						11	210	
						12	220	
		N	lisses: 4			13	230	
	Hits: 7			14	240			
						15	250	

Cache Size

Direct Mapped Cache (Reading)





Direct Mapped Cache Size

Offset

n bit index, *m* bit offset Q: How big is cache (data only)? Q: How much SRAM needed (data + overhead)? Cache of size 2ⁿ blocks Block size of 2^m bytes Tag field: 32 - (n + m)Valid bit: 1

Bits in cache: $2^n \times (block size + tag size + valid bit size)$ = $2^n (2^m bytes \times 8 bits-per-byte + (32-n-m) + 1)$

Fully Associative Cache (Reading)



Fully Associative Cache Size

Offset

m bit offset , 2ⁿ cache lines

Tag

Q: How big is cache (data only)?

Q: How much SRAM needed (data + overhead)?

cache lines × block SIZC

 $2^{n} \times 2^{m} by tes = 2^{n+m}$

overhead

tag = 32 - MVa(1d = 1)

Fully Associative Cache Size

Offset

Tag

m bit offset , 2^{*n*} cache lines Q: How big is cache (data only)? Q: How much SRAM needed (data + overhead)? Cache of size 2ⁿ blocks Block size of 2^m bytes Tag field: 32 – m Valid bit: 1

Bits in cache: 2ⁿ x (block size + tag size + valid bit size) = 2ⁿ (2^m bytes x 8 bits-per-byte + (32-m) + 1) Fully-associative reduces conflict misses...... assuming good eviction strategyMem access trace: 0, 16, 1, 17, 2, 18, 3, 19, 4, 20, ...Hit rate with four fully-associative 2-byte cache lines?

hitrate 505

 ... but large block size can still reduce hit rate vector add trace: 0, 100, 200, 1, 101, 201, 2, 202, ... Hit rate with four fully-associative 2-byte cache lines?



With two fully-associative 4-byte cache lines?



<u>Misses</u>

Cache misses: classification

Cold (aka Compulsory)

• The line is being referenced for the first time

Capacity

- The line was evicted because the cache was too small
- i.e. the *working set* of program is larger than the cache

Conflict

 The line was evicted because of another access whose index conflicted

Cache Tradeoffs

Direct Mapped		Fully Associative
+ Smaller	Tag Size	Larger –
+ Less	SRAM Overhead	More –
+ Less	Controller Logic	More –
+ Faster	Speed	Slower –
+ Less	Price	More –
+ Very	Scalability	Not Very –
– Lots	# of conflict misses	Zero +
– Low	Hit rate	High +
– Common	Pathological Cases?	?

Administrivia

Prelim2 *today*, Thursday, March 29th at 7:30pm

Location is Phillips 101 and prelim2 starts at 7:30pm

Project2 due next Monday, April 2nd

Summary

Caching assumptions

- small working set: 90/10 rule
- can predict future: spatial & temporal locality

Benefits

big & fast memory built from (big & slow) + (small & fast)

Tradeoffs:

- associativity, line size, hit cost, miss penalty, hit rate
- Fully Associative → higher hit cost, higher hit rate
- Larger block size \rightarrow lower hit cost, higher miss penalty

Next up: other designs; writing to caches