Announcements

- HW 3 out: cache simulation
  - Recitations this week on C/Unix/etc.
  - Due Nov 6th

- HW 4 out on Nov 5th
  - Due Nov 14th

- PA 3 out Nov 14th
  - Due Nov 25th (feel free to turn it in early)
  - Demos and pizza party: Dec 1st or 2nd

- Prelim 2: Dec 4th

- Final project: Due exam week
2-Way Set-Associative Cache

Cache Design

- Need to determine parameters
  - Block size
  - Number of ways of set-associativity
  - Eviction policy
  - Write policy
  - Separate I-cache from D-cache
Tradeoff

- Larger sizes reduce the overhead by
  - Reducing the number of tags
  - Reducing the size of each tag

- But
  - Have fewer blocks available
  - And the time to fetch the block on a miss is longer

Cache Writes

- No-Write
  - writes invalidate the cache and go to memory
- Write-Through
  - writes go to main memory and cache
- Write-Back
  - write cache, write main memory only when block is evicted
What about Stores?

- Where should you write the result of a store?
  - If that memory location is in the cache?
    - Send it to the cache
    - Should we also send it to memory right away? (write-through policy)
    - Wait until we kick the block out (write-back policy)
  - If it is not in the cache?
    - Allocate the line (put it in the cache)? (write allocate policy)
    - Write it directly to memory without allocation? (no write allocate policy)

Write-through vs. Write-back

- Write-through is slower
  - But cleaner (memory always consistent)

- Write-back is faster
  - But complicated when multi cores sharing memory
Dirty Bits and Write-Back Buffers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Data Byte 0, Byte 1 … Byte N</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dirty bits indicate which lines have been written
- Dirty bits enable the cache to handle multiple writes to the same cache line without having to go to memory
- Dirty bit reset when line is allocated
- Set when block is written
- Write-back buffer
  - A queue where dirty lines are placed
  - Items added to the end as dirty lines are evicted from the cache
  - Items removed from the front as memory writes are completed

Short Performance Discussion

- Complicated
  - Time from start-to-end (wall-clock time)
  - System time, user time
  - CPI (Cycles per instruction)

- Ideal CPI?
Cache Performance

- Consider hit (H) and miss ratio (M)
- $H \times AT_{cache} + M \times AT_{memory}$
- Hit rate = 1 – Miss rate
- Access Time is given in cycles
- Ratio of Access times, 1:50

- 90% : $0.90 + 0.1 \times 50 = 5.9$
- 95% : $0.95 + 0.05 \times 50 = 0.95 + 2.5 = 3.45$
- 99% : $0.99 + 0.01 \times 50 = 1.49$
- 99.9%: $0.999 + 0.001 \times 50 = 0.999 + 0.05 = 1.049$

Cache Hit/Miss Rate

- Consider processor that is 2x times faster
  – But memory is same speed

- Since AT is access time in terms of cycle time: it doubles 2x
- $H \times AT_{cache} + M \times AT_{memory}$
- Ratio of Access times, 1:100
- 99% : $0.99 + 0.01 \times 100 = 1.99$
Cache Hit/Miss Rate

- Original is 1GHz, 1ns is cycle time
- CPI (cycles per instruction): 1.49
- Therefore, 1.49 ns for each instruction

- New is 2GHz, 0.5 ns is cycle time.
- CPI: 1.99, 0.5ns. 0.995 ns for each instruction.

- So it doesn’t go to 0.745 ns for each instruction.
- Speedup is 1.5x (not 2x)

Adding a L2 cache

- CPI: 1.0, Clock: 2GHz
- Access time is 100 ns
- Miss rate: 2%

- Say we add a L2 cache 5ns access time
  - New Miss rate: 0.5%
Misses

• Three types of misses
  – Cold
    ▪ The line is being referenced for the first time
  – Capacity
    ▪ The line was evicted because the cache was not large enough
  – Conflict
    ▪ The line was evicted because of another access whose index conflicted

Cache Conscious Programming

```c
int a[NCOL][NROW];
int sum = 0;

for(j = 0; j < NCOL; ++j)
  for(i = 0; i < NROW; ++i)
    sum += a[j][i];

• Speed up this program!
```
Cache Conscious Programming

int a[NCOL][NROW];
int sum = 0;

for(j = 0; j < NCOL; ++j)
    for(i = 0; i < NROW; ++i)
        sum += a[j][i];

• Every access is a cache miss!

---

Cache Conscious Programming

int a[NCOL][NROW];
int sum = 0;

for(i = 0; i < NROW; ++i)
    for(j = 0; j < NCOL; ++j)
        sum += a[j][i];

• Block size: 4, 75% hit rate
• Block size: 8, 87.5% hit rate
• Block size: 16, 93.75% hit rate
• Or you can warm the cache… when does that make sense?
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Processor & Memory

• Processor’s address lines are routed via the system bus to the memory banks
  – Simple, fast

• What happens when the program issues a lw/sw to an invalid location?
  – e.g. 0x000000000
  – Or, uninitialized pointer
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Multiple Processes

- Mail, web browser, skype, …
  - Co-exist
    - How? Take turns?
    - Do they stomp on each other?
  - Multiple processes must co-exist

- Many cores in a computer
  - Multiple processors must co-exist

Multiple Processors

- What happens when another program is executed concurrently on another processor?
  - The addresses will conflict
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Solution? Multiple processes/processors

- We could try to relocate the second program to another location
  - Assuming there is one
  - Introduces more problems!
    - What if they don’t fit
    - What if it is not contiguous
    - Etc.

Virtual Memory

- Solves all these problems!

- Each process has its own view of memory
  - Called virtual address space
  - So can conceptually put your code, data in the place you want it

- On-the-fly at runtime
  - Need translation from virtual address space to physical address space of machine
  - Relocate loads and stores to actual memory
Two Programs Sharing Physical Memory

- The starting location of each page (either in main memory or in secondary memory) is contained in the program’s page table.
Address Space

- **Interface**
  - Programs load/store to virtual addresses
  - Actual memory uses physical addresses
- **Memory Management Unit (MMU)**

Virtual Memory Advantages

- **Easy relocation**
  - Simplifies loading a program for execution by providing for code relocation (i.e., the code can be loaded anywhere in main memory)
  - Also, illusion of contiguous memory

- **Easy sharing**
  - Allows efficient and safe sharing of memory among multiple programs/multiple cores
Virtual Memory Advantages

- Can run programs larger than physical memory
  - “Virtualization”
  - Use main memory as a “cache” for secondary memory: illusion of large memory
  - Based on Principle of Locality
    ▪ The 90/10 rule
    ▪ A program is likely to access a relatively small portion of its address space during any period of time

Virtual Memory Advantages

- Virtualization
  - CPU: if process is not doing anything, switch
  - Memory: when not using it, somebody else can use it
How to make it work?

• Challenge: Virtual Memory can be slow!
• At run-time: virtual address must be translated to a physical address
• MMU (combination of hardware and software)

Address Translation

• How to translate addresses?
  – Per word? Much too expensive
  – Per block? Sure, but what is block size?

• Costs dictate granularity of translation
  – Cost to disk is very large
  – Block size has to be large too
    • Amortization
### Paging

- Divide memory into small pages
- A program’s address space is divided into pages (all one fixed size)
  - Typical: 4KB to 16KB
  - Example:
    - virtual address space: $2^{32} = 4\text{GB} = 4 \times 2^{30}$
    - physical address space: 512 MB or 1 GB
    - page size: 4KB
    - Number of pages in memory: $2^{18}$
    - Number of page table entries: $2^{20}$
    - Page Table size = 4MB

### Page Table

- Each process has separate mapping of virtual to physical pages
- Page Table: stores this translation
  - Basically a huge array of translations
Address Translation

- So each memory request *first* requires an address translation from the virtual space to the physical space

Virtual Address (VA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31 30</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>12 11</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtual page number</td>
<td>Page offset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>12 11</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical page number</td>
<td>Page offset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Address (PA)

Page Table for Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtual page #</th>
<th>Offset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical page #</td>
<td>Offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical page base addr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Table (in main memory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main memory

Disk storage

Swap space
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