

# Energy Efficient Project 1

Leo Lei and Yu Lim

## 1. Design Decisions

We implemented a write-through cache policy, or when we write we update both L1 and L2 caches. We assume writing to DRAM from L2 cache eviction is an asynchronous operation, and thus we don't increment the global clock. We also decided not to add a dirty bit to the L2 cache: this doesn't affect correctness but does make it a bit less energy efficient if we're writing to DRAM something that is already up to date. This means that our simulator will have more writes to DRAM, contributing to slightly higher energy consumption than a dirty-bit implementation.

## 2. Table of Results

The full table can be found at the link:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1U3Bf9xLHm\\_Soe3t3I-DQGZxAp0p-9mnjAWmKOCOy2I/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1U3Bf9xLHm_Soe3t3I-DQGZxAp0p-9mnjAWmKOCOy2I/edit?usp=sharing)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	L2 Associativity	Total Time (ms)	Total Energy (mJ)	L1i Access	L1i Misses	L1i Energy (mJ)	L1d Access	L1d Misses	L1d Energy (mJ)
espresso	2	0.8224	2.8596	809368	1701	0.6136	191508	1002	0.4591
	4	0.8224	2.8596	809368	1701	0.6136	191508	1001	0.4591
	8	0.8224	2.8596	809368	1701	0.6136	191508	1002	0.4591
spice2g6	2	0.8955	3.163	784179	2607	0.6438	216221	793	0.5018
	4	0.8955	3.163	784179	2607	0.6438	216221	793	0.5018
	8	0.8955	3.163	784179	2607	0.6438	216221	793	0.5018
doduc	2	1.0732	4.8044	755193	4219	0.7254	245816	2816	0.5981
	4	1.0732	4.8044	755193	4219	0.7254	245816	2816	0.5981
	8	1.0732	4.0844	755193	4219	0.7254	245816	2816	0.5981
li	2	1.055	3.8353	742254	2382	0.7131	258874	4827	0.5922
	4	1.055	3.8353	742254	2382	0.7131	258874	4827	0.5922
	8	1.055	3.8353	742254	2382	0.7131	258874	4827	0.5922
eqntott	2	0.9459	3.4281	769759	217	0.6653	232495	2056	0.531
	4	0.9458	3.4281	769759	217	0.6653	232495	2056	0.531
	8	0.9458	3.4281	769759	217	0.6653	232495	2056	0.531
compress	2		6.1254	721216	123	0.9248	280174	12869	0.8146
	4	1.4889	6.1249	721216	123	0.9248	280174	12869	0.8145
	8	1.4889	6.1249	721216	123	0.9248	280174	12869	0.8145
mdljdp2	2	0.8672	3.1322	768543	1120	0.6258	232995	1437	0.4919
	4	0.8672	3.1322	768543	1120	0.6258	232995	1437	0.4919
	8	0.8672	3.1322	768543	1120	0.6258	232995	1437	0.4919
wave5	2	0.7578	2.6116	827600	465	0.5858	172446	369	0.422
	4	0.7578	2.6116	827600	465	0.5858	172446	369	0.422
	8	0.7578	2.6116	827600	465	0.5858	172446	369	0.422

A	B	K	L	M	N	O
	L2 Associativity	L2 Access	L2 Misses	L2 Energy (mJ)	DRAM Access	DRAM Energy (mJ)
espresso	2	62433	798	0.9966	824	0.7903
	4	62433	798	0.9966	824	0.7903
	8	62433	798	0.9967	824	0.7903
spice2g6	2	76667	976	1.1326	1044	0.8848
	4	76667	976	1.1326	1044	0.8848
	8	76667	976	1.1326	1044	0.8848
doduc	2	98051	2578	1.392	3122	1.369
	4	98051	2578	1.392	3122	1.369
	8	98051	2578	1.392	3122	1.369
li	2	107962	1320	1.432	1566	1.0995
	4	107962	1320	1.431	1566	1.0995
	8	107962	1320	1.43	1566	1.0995
eqntott	2	81006	1595	1.1947	1735	1.037
	4	81006	1595	1.1947	1735	1.037
	8	81006	1595	1.1947	1735	1.037
compress	2	157277	5553	2.0441	7010	2.3419
	4	157277	5552	2.0441	7008	2.3416
	8	157277	5552	20.441	7008	2.3416
mdljdp2	2	65447	1421	1.0488	1668	0.9656
	4	65447	1421	1.0489	1668	0.9656
	8	65447	1421	1.0489	1668	0.9656
wave5	2	48965	743	0.8713	784	0.7325
	4	48965	743	0.8713	784	0.7325
	8	48965	743	0.8713	784	0.7325

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	L2 Associativity	Total Time (ms)	Total Energy (mJ)	L1i Access	L1i Misses	L1i Energy (mJ)	L1d Access	L1d Misses	L1d Energy (mJ)
wave5	2	0.7578	2.6116	827600	465	0.5858	172446	369	0.422
	4	0.7578	2.6116	827600	465	0.5858	172446	369	0.422
	8	0.7578	2.6116	827600	465	0.5858	172446	369	0.422
tomcatv	2	1.5219	7.0929	615544	88	0.9148	384462	10321	0.8571
	4	1.521	7.0849	615544	88	0.9144	384462	10321	0.8566
	8	1.5209	7.084	615544	88	0.9143	384462	10321	0.8566
ora	2	0.7953	2.7377	799771	354	0.5976	200251	232	0.4477
	4	0.7953	2.7377	799771	354	0.5976	200251	232	0.4477
	8	0.7953	2.7377	799771	354	0.5976	200251	232	0.4477
gcc	2	1.0735	4.084	779515	12708	0.7317	221471	5497	0.5921
	4	1.0795	4.06	779515	12708	0.7304	221471	5497	0.5909
	8	1.0708	4.0586	779515	12708	0.7304	221471	5497	0.5908
su2cor	2	1.1763	4.5328	737181	481	0.7725	262915	3135	0.6539
	4	1.1763	4.5328	737181	481	0.7725	262915	3135	0.6539
	8	1.1763	4.5328	737181	481	0.7725	262915	3135	0.6539
hydro2d	2	1.2171	5.406	748688	887	0.7957	251439	11935	0.6715
	4	1.202	5.2639	748688	887	0.7882	251439	11935	0.6639
	8	1.197	5.217	748688	887	0.7857	251439	11935	0.6614
nasa7	2	1.0084	3.8736	802971	463	0.7049	197074	2875	0.5535
	4	1.0084	3.8736	802971	463	0.7049	197074	2875	0.5535
	8	1.0084	3.8736	802971	463	0.7049	197074	2875	0.5535
fpppp	2	1.0997	4.156	700500	7768	0.725	299522	5375	0.6247
	4	1.0995	4.1541	700500	7768	0.7249	299522	5375	0.6246
	8	1.0995	4.1541	700500	7768	0.7249	299522	5375	0.6246

A	B	K	L	M	N	O
	L2 Associativity	L2 Access	L2 Misses	L2 Energy (mJ)	DRAM Access	DRAM Energy (mJ)
wave5	2	48965	743	0.8713	784	0.7325
	4	48965	743	0.8713	784	0.7325
	8	48965	743	0.8713	784	0.7325
tomcatv	2	132105	8534	1.9317	13014	3.3893
	4	132105	8517	1.9311	12980	3.3829
	8	132105	8515	1.931	12976	3.3821
ora	2	59542	542	0.9582	605	0.7343
	4	59542	542	0.9582	605	0.7343
	8	59542	542	0.9582	605	0.7343
gcc	2	97584	2511	1.3965	3084	1.3637
	4	97584	2460	1.3944	2982	1.344
	8	97584	2457	1.3943	2976	1.3432
su2cor	2	117751	2918	1.5779	3588	1.5286
	4	117751	2918	1.5779	3588	1.5286
	8	117751	2918	1.5779	3588	1.5286
hydro2d	2	92379	5951	1.478	8923	2.4608
	4	92379	5649	1.4657	8319	2.3461
	8	92379	5549	1.4616	8119	2.3081
nasa7	2	79890	2971	1.2386	3496	1.3767
	4	79890	2971	1.2386	3496	1.3767
	8	79890	2971	1.2386	3496	1.3767
fpppp	2	107522	2209	1.4673	2797	1.339
	4	107522	2205	1.4671	2789	1.3375
	8	107522	2205	1.4671	2789	1.3375

### 3. Comment on how L2 set associativity affects the system from the above table

Overall, the varying associativity levels (2, 4, 8) did not significantly impact the energy consumption for most workloads. For the workloads that saw a change in energy consumption between different associativity levels, generally less energy was consumed at higher associativity levels. For instance with the tomcat instruction set we can see a slight decrease in DRAM access and energy with a higher cache association. This could be attributed to the fact that larger sets could potentially mean less line eviction and thus less of a need to go to DRAM from L2.

### 4.

Our code is included in this zip file. It can also be found at the *GitHub link*:

<https://github.com/yellowfish15/cache-sim-ee>