Exploring Latency-Power Tradeoffs in Deep Nonvolatile Memory Hierarchies

Doe Hyun Yoon, Tobin Gonzalez, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, and Robert S. Schreiber

Intelligent Infrastructure Lab (IIL), Hewlett-Packard Labs

Computing Frontiers – May 15 2012

Deeper and Deeper Memory Hierarchy

Cache memory for reducing average memory latency

- Initially, a small L1 cache
- Then, L2, L3, ...
- DRAM cache for NVM main memory
- SLC / MLC NVM memory

Is a DEEP hierarchy power efficient?

We develop a model to explore latency-power tradeoffs

Flattened hierarchies with a large NVM cache are power efficient



Proc

SRAM

SRAM L2

SRAM L3

DRAM cache

SLC NVM

MLC NVM

1. Latency-Power Model



Estimate power and performance of an application Exhaustive search to find Pareto-optimal frontier



Application Characteristics



Example) SPEC CPU 2006



Example) MiniFE, MiniMD, and Graph 500



Technology Parameters

Latency, static power, and energy per access of different caches

SRAM and DRAM \rightarrow CACTI 6

Phase-Change RAM (PCRAM) → NVSim



Performance Model

Use AMAT (Average Memory Access Time)

 $AMAT = L(1) + \Sigma [M(i)/M(0) \times L(i+1)]$

Total N cache levels

L(i): Latency of cache level i (tech parameter) M(i): MPKI of cache level i (app characteristic)



Power Model

$$P = P_{static} + P_{dyn}$$

 $P_{static} = \Sigma P_{s}(i)$



$$E_{dyn} = M(0) \times E(1) + \Sigma[M(i) \times (E_r(i+1) + E_w(i))]$$

$$P_{dyn} = E_{dyn} / [(1000 - M(0)) \times T_{cyc} + AMAT \times M(0)]$$

E(i): Energy per access (tech parameter) T_{cyc}: cycle time (1ns in our study)

Time to execute 1000 instrs



The Model, Again



Exhaustive Search Example





Pareto-Optimal Frontier





Optimum Configurations



2. Depth of a Cache Hierarchy

Use the latency-power model

SRAM caches, ranging from 32kB to 2GB 2 to 6-level hierarchies





MiniFE





Lessons Learned

- Cache hierarchies deeper than 3 levels
- →Increase AMAT
- →Use more power

- Large SRAM caches
- → Increase static power a lot
- → Only a small improvement in AMAT



3. Cache Hierarchies with NVM

Use the latency-power model

Replace DRAM main memory with NVM main memory

Caches with heterogeneous technologies

- SRAM caches, ranging 32kB to 32MB
- DRAM caches, ranging 4MB to 64MB
- PCRAM caches, ranging 16MB to 1GB



Graph 500



MCF



4. Streaming Patterns

Working set is simply larger than the cache

LRU policy thrashes data

Large caches can't improve AMAT but waste power unless the cache is larger than the working set



MiniFE



Alternative Replacement Policy

Inserted lines are never replaced

Mimicking more recent techniques such as DIP [Qureshi+ ISCA'07] or RRIP [Jaleel+ ISCA'10]

Can preserve a fraction of working set in the cache



MiniFE: MPKI vs. Cache Size



MiniFE with the Alternative Policy



Conclusions

Developed a latency-power model

Deep hierarchies are less power efficient than flat hierarchies

Large NVM caches can be power efficient

Advanced insertion/replacement policy should be combined to handle streaming patterns.



Limitations

Assumed a blocking in-order core Ignored memory level parallelism, prefetching, ...

Write endurance in NVM caches

Aggressive power control in SRAM caches



Acknowledgement & Disclaimer

This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Energy under Award Number DE-SC0005026.

See <u>http://www.hpl.hp.com/DoE-Disclaimer.html</u> for additional information



Exploring Latency-Power Tradeoffs in Deep Nonvolatile Memory Hierarchies

Doe Hyun Yoon, Tobin Gonzalez, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, and Robert S. Schreiber

Intelligent Infrastructure Lab (IIL), Hewlett-Packard Labs

Computing Frontiers – May 15 2012