Efficiency: caching

COSC 208, Introduction to Computer Systems, 2021-11-01

Announcements

• Project 2 Part B due date extended to Tues, Nov 9

Outline

- Warm-up
- · Instances of caching
- · Cache replacement

Warm-up

Q1: Cross-out unnecessary loads and stores from the assembly code.

Instances of caching

- · CPU caches
 - Why do we have caches on the CPU? accessing main memory is ~100x slower than accessing a register
 - Store instructions and data (stack, heap, etc.) from main memory
 - Three levels --- L1, L2, and L3
 - Range in size from a few KB to a few MB
 - Cache line (i.e., cache entry) is typically larger than a word e.g., 128 bytes
 - Why? spatial locality
 - What happens when we write to memory?
 - Write through cache write to the cache and main memory
 - Write back cache initially write to the cache; write to main memory when the entry is evicted from the cache
 - What are the advantages of each approach?
 - Write through cache ensures consistency between CPU cores
 - Write back cache only incurs the overhead of accessing main memory when absolutely necessary
- Web browser caches
 - Why do web browsers have caches?
 - Accessing remote network storage is >50x slower than accessing a solid state drive (SSD)
 - Spatial locality many aspects of a web page are also used with other pages on the same site: e.g., images, Cascading Style Sheets (CSS), JavaScript (JS)
 - Temporal locality users often visit the same web page repeatedly: e.g., Google
 - Internet Service Provider (ISP) may limit amount of data downloaded/uploaded per month
 - Store static content (e.g., images, CSS, JS)

- Web browser caches are read-only
- · Domain Name System (DNS) caches
 - DNS is used to translate domain names (e.g., portal.colgate.edu) into Internet Protocol (IP) addresses (e.g., 149.43.134.29)
 - DNS entries—i.e., mappings from domain names to IP addresses—can be cached by a web browser, an operating system, and a recursive resolver
 - A recursive resolver is a DNS server within a network that receives DNS queries from clients and queries other DNS servers on the client's behalf in order to locate the desired DNS entry
 - Why are DNS entries cached?
 - Contacting a recursive resolver (and other DNS servers) is much slower than access a solid state drive (SSD)
 - Spatial locality users often visit subdomains of a domain, e.g., portal.colgate.edu, moodle.colgate.edu, and cs.colgate.edu are subdomains of colgate.edu
 - Temporal locality users often visit the same domain repeatedly
 - Mappings from domain names to IP addresses change infrequently —> DNS entries can be cached for hours or days
- Content distribution networks (CDNs)
 - o Collection of geographically distributed servers that delivery content (e.g., streaming videos) to users
 - User's computers contact a server that is "nearby"
 - Ideally measured in terms of latency, which is a function of geographic distance, network routes, and network load
 - Analogy: time it takes to drive somewhere is a function of geographic distance, the route you take, and the amount of traffic on the road
 - CDN servers fetch and cache content from origin servers
 - o Popular content (e.g., image from the front page of the NY Times) is more likely to already be cached

Cache replacement

- If a cache is full, then a cache entry must be removed so different data can be placed in the cache
- · Cache replacement policy governs which data is removed
- What should a good cache replacement policy do? maximize the number of cache hits (or minimize the number of cache misses)
 - Evaluation metric: Hit ratio = number of hits / total number of memory accesses
- How do we determine which cache entry to replace?
- · Optimal replacement policy: policy that replaces the entry that will be accessed furthest in the future
 - Impractical because we don't know data access patterns a priori
- First-in First-out (FIFO)
 - Simple to implement
 - Doesn't consider the importance of a cache entry
- Random
 - Even simpler to implement
 - Doesn't consider the importance of a cache entry
- Least Frequently Used (LFU) and Least Recently Used (LRU)
 - Based on the principle of locality
 - LFU assumes a page that is accessed many times will be accessed many more times
 - LRU assumes a page that was accessed recently will be accessed again soon
 - Inverse is very bad replacement policy
 - Downside: lots of overhead to implement need to store an ordered list of pages and move a page up in the list whenever it's accessed
 - Where does this go wrong? when working-set size (i.e., number of repeatedly accessed entries) is (slightly) greater than size of the cache
- Assume a cache can hold 3 entries and the following 15 data accesses occur: 3, 4, 4, 5, 3, 2, 3, 4, 1, 4, 4, 2, 5, 2, 4. Assuming the cache is initially empty, what is the hit ratio for each of the following algorithms?
 - Optimal +3, +4, H4, +5, H3, -5/+2, H3, H4, -3/+1, H4, H4, H2, -1/+5, H2, H4 9/15 = 60%
 - o Q2: FIFO +3, +4, H4, +5, H3, -3/+2, -4/+3, -5/+4, -2/+1, H4, H4, -3/+2, -4/+5, H2, -1/+4 5/15 33%
 - Q3: LRU +3, +4, H4, +5, H3, -4/+2, H3, -5/+4, -2/+1, H4, H4, -3/+2, -1/+5, H2, H4 7/15 = 47%
 - Q4: LFU +3, +4, H4, +5, H3, -5/+2, H3, H4, -2/+1, H4, H4, -1/+2, -2/+5, -5/+2, H4 7/15 = 47%