

Whirlpool: Improving Dynamic Cache Management with Static Data Classification

Anurag Mukkara Nathan Beckmann Daniel Sanchez

Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
{anuragm, beckmann, sanchez}@csail.mit.edu

Abstract

Cache hierarchies are increasingly non-uniform and difficult to manage. Several techniques, such as scratchpads or reuse hints, use static information about how programs access data to manage the memory hierarchy. Static techniques are effective on regular programs, but because they set fixed policies, they are vulnerable to changes in program behavior or available cache space. Instead, most systems rely on dynamic caching policies that adapt to observed program behavior. Unfortunately, dynamic policies spend significant resources trying to learn how programs use memory, and yet they often perform worse than a static policy.

We present Whirlpool, a novel approach that combines static information with dynamic policies to reap the benefits of each. Whirlpool statically classifies data into *pools* based on how the program uses memory. Whirlpool then uses dynamic policies to tune the cache to each pool. Hence, rather than setting policies statically, Whirlpool uses static analysis to guide dynamic policies. We present both an API that lets programmers specify pools manually and a profiling tool that discovers pools automatically in unmodified binaries.

We evaluate Whirlpool on a state-of-the-art NUCA cache. Whirlpool significantly outperforms prior approaches: on sequential programs, Whirlpool improves performance by up to 38% and reduces data movement energy by up to 53%; on parallel programs, Whirlpool improves performance by up to 67% and reduces data movement energy by up to $2.6\times$.

CCS Concepts

- Computer systems organization → Multicore architectures.

Keywords Non-uniform cache access (NUCA), Data movement, Static analysis, Cache modeling.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

ASPLOS '16, April 2–6, 2016, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM 978-1-4503-4091-5/16/04...\$15.00.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2872362.2872363>

1. Introduction

Future systems will be limited by data movement, which is orders of magnitude more expensive than basic compute operations. For example, at 28 nm a 64-bit floating-point multiply-add consumes 20 pJ, while sending 256 bits across the chip costs 300 pJ, an on-chip access to a 1 MB cache costs about 1 nJ, and an off-chip DRAM access costs 20–50 nJ— $1000\times$ more energy than the multiply-add [21, 36, 59]. The trend towards lean, specialized cores means that, for efficiency reasons, caches are increasingly distributed across the chip and have non-uniform access latencies (NUCA [37]).

While distributed caches are more efficient, they are also harder to manage. Their non-uniform latency and energy means that *data placement* is critical to limit data movement. But data placement is hard: applications need to fit their most intensely-used data in nearby banks, while competing with each other for scarce capacity. Data placement is a spatial scheduling problem that, to solve well, requires accurate information about how programs use memory.

Unfortunately, all the relevant information is not generally available: static analysis or profiling can reveal program semantics (i.e., how a program uses memory), but not its dynamic or input-dependent behavior; and dynamic policies have difficulty efficiently recovering program semantics. To see this in more detail, consider the extremes of static vs. dynamic design. At one extreme, scratchpad-based systems expose the distributed memories to software, relying on static analysis to place data. Scratchpads work well on regular access patterns, but cope poorly with irregular, input-dependent, or rapidly changing patterns and varying resources in shared systems [38, 41]. At the other extreme, cache-based systems expose a flat address space that programs access through undifferentiated loads and stores, relying on hardware-managed caches to transparently retain the right data. Most memory systems are cache-based, but recovering program semantics from this limited interface is difficult and expensive. For example, classic dynamic NUCA schemes migrate data towards the requester in response to each access, which increases data movement and requires expensive lookups [7, 9, 28]. As memory systems become more complex, ignoring program semantics becomes increasingly inefficient.

Prior work exploits static information in cache-based systems through prefetch [34], bypass [48], and cache priority [27] hints. Hints let software override dynamic policies and control the cache, reaping the benefits of static information when it is accurate. However, hints suffer from the same problems as scratchpads: with uncertain or dynamic behavior, hints are often inaccurate and hurt performance [41, 47].

The key idea of this paper is to combine static information with dynamic policies to reap the benefits of each. Rather than using static information to set fixed policies, we instead use it to inform dynamic policies. The insight is that, while uncertainty makes it hard to statically predict how data will be used, it is often easy to accurately group data with similar usage patterns. This approach lets dynamic policies make better decisions at lower overhead.

We demonstrate this idea through Whirlpool, a *classification-based* approach to improve data placement in multicores. In Whirlpool, programs divide their data into a small number of memory *pools*, e.g. one for each major data structure. We find that for most programs, a few pools (three or four) suffice. Hardware then monitors each pool dynamically and adapts the memory system to keep the most valuable data near where it is used. Unlike hints, pools do not encode static policies; rather, they make it easy for hardware to find the right policies dynamically. Whirlpool thus combines static program semantics with dynamic policies, and robustly adapts to changes in program behavior or available resources (Sec. 2).

Whirlpool has both software and hardware components (Sec. 3). In software, Whirlpool provides a memory allocator that groups semantically similar data and tags each page with a pool id. In hardware, Whirlpool extends prior NUCA techniques [9, 11] to monitor each pool and control its placement. Whirlpool needs only a few pools, so it adds small overheads. We first evaluate Whirlpool by manually applying it to several SPEC CPU2006 and PBBS benchmarks. We show that Whirlpool achieves significant performance gains, of up to 38%, when managing a large NUCA cache, and reduces data movement energy by up to 53%. Through case studies, we also show that Whirlpool improves the performance of parallel applications on a 16-core chip by up to 67% and reduces data movement energy by up to 2.6 \times .

We then use the insights gained from manually porting applications to design *WhirlTool*, a profiling tool that automatically discovers pools in unmodified binaries (Sec. 4). We evaluate WhirlTool on a comprehensive set of benchmarks and program mixes, and find that it works as well or better than our careful manual classification.

In summary, Whirlpool gives a promising way to combine static program semantics and dynamic policies to reduce data movement.

2. Motivation and Background

In this section, we motivate Whirlpool’s hybrid, static-dynamic design and discuss related work.

2.1 How static classification reduces data movement

Consider the multicore shown in Fig. 1. This chip has a NUCA cache of twenty-five 512 KB banks shared by four surrounding cores, similar to the Oracle SPARC M7 [3] (see Appendix A for detailed methodology). We consider the benchmark *dt* (Delaunay triangulation) from the PBBS suite [60], running in the leftmost core. Our goal is to use this distributed cache capacity as efficiently as possible by placing *dt*’s most intensely used data near where *dt* is running.




Figure 1: Multicore chip with a *dt*’s working set and distributed last-level cache.

Figure 2: Breakdown of *dt*’s working set and access pattern.

Fig. 2 shows how *dt* accesses memory. It has a 6 MB working set that easily fits in the cache. It accesses three data structures: **points**, **vertices**, and **triangles**, which take 0.5 MB, 1.5 MB, and 4 MB, respectively. Accesses are split roughly evenly across the three data structures, so their access *intensity* (i.e., accesses per MB) varies: **points** are accessed most intensely, followed by **vertices** and **triangles**.

How should we place *dt*’s data to reduce data movement? Many commercial processors adopt a static NUCA (S-NUCA) design that hashes addresses evenly across banks [37, 53]. Fig. 3 shows how S-NUCA places *dt*’s data. This figure shows all 25 cache banks, with colors indicating where data is placed. Because S-NUCA spreads *dt*’s 6 MB working set across 12.5 MB of cache, banks are left half-empty.




Figure 3: S-NUCA places *dt*’s data unnecessarily far away.

Since capacity is available in closer banks, we can reduce data movement by concentrating *dt*’s data closer to where *dt* is running. Fig. 4 shows how Jigsaw [9, 11], the NUCA scheme that Whirlpool builds on, places *dt*’s data. Jigsaw tightly packs *dt*’s working set near the left of the chip, but

it cannot distinguish between the different data structures because it is blind to program semantics.




Figure 4: Jigsaw places dt’s data closer, but does not distinguish between types of data.

We can reduce data movement further by placing the most intensely accessed data even closer to where dt is running. Fig. 5 shows how Whirlpool places dt’s data. Whirlpool classifies data into pools statically, but dynamically monitors each pool to decide data placement. In this case, because **points** is most intensely accessed, it is placed in the closest cache banks. Likewise, **vertices** is placed in three next-closest banks, and **triangles** in the closest remaining banks.




Figure 5: Whirlpool statically classifies dt’s data into pools, and dynamically places intensely-accessed pools nearby.

Whirlpool improves dt’s performance by 19% over S-NUCA and by 15% over Jigsaw, and reduces data movement energy (cache and memory dynamic energy) by 42% over S-NUCA and by 27% over Jigsaw.

This example shows how static, program-level data classification can help dynamic policies reduce data movement. By identifying key data structures statically, Whirlpool can place data without wasting resources in learning how data is used. By contrast, many prior schemes that achieve a similar data placement do so by migrating data on demand [18, 43, 68]. The extra data movement from migrations can exceed the energy savings of smart data placement (see Sec. 2.3). Hence, static classification is crucial to Whirlpool’s benefits.

2.2 How dynamic policies reduce data movement

Whirlpool leverages static data classification from either the programmer or an automatic profile-guided tool. Whirlpool also monitors each pool at run-time and uses this dynamic

information to reconfigure the cache. By decoupling classification and policy, Whirlpool robustly adapts to changes in application behavior and system configuration. By contrast, other techniques that involve application-level or code changes, such as software prefetching [47], reuse/non-temporal hints [12, 14, 27, 48, 63], or loop tiling [20, 39, 64], directly encode a fixed policy in the program and cannot adapt to changing application or system behavior.

To see why adapting dynamically is important, consider *l_{bm}* from SPEC CPU2006. On each timestep, *l_{bm}* operates on two grids, source and destination, with markedly different access patterns: source is accessed more often and enjoys good reuse, while destination sees little reuse. At the end of each timestep, *l_{bm}* swaps the source and destination pointers, resulting in an alternating access pattern to both memory pools, shown in Fig. 6. Whirlpool continuously monitors both pools and adopts different policies on even and odd phases, caching source data near *l_{bm}* and bypassing accesses to the destination grid. As a result Whirlpool outperforms Jigsaw by 4.8%, and reduces data movement energy by 12%. By contrast, each pool looks the same on average, so the best static placement yields no improvement over Jigsaw.




Figure 6: *l_{bm}* has two pools that, though indistinguishable on average, have markedly different access patterns in alternating program phases.

This example shows that while static *classification* into pools may suffice, dynamic *policies* are needed to reduce *l_{bm}*’s data movement. Moreover, program phase changes are not the only source of unpredictability. The appropriate caching policy depends on many factors that are hard to capture statically: irregular reference patterns, different program inputs, cache contention in shared systems, etc. Sec. 3 explores how Whirlpool’s dynamic policies adapt to these sources of dynamic variability.

2.3 Related work

Whirlpool builds upon many prior memory management techniques. Broadly, these techniques fall into two categories, based on whether they consider modifying the program to improve memory system behavior. Table 1 summarizes the pros and cons of each technique.

Techniques that require program changes: Architectures with software-managed scratchpad memories provide the highest efficiency and degree of control, letting programmers

Scheme	Static information	Dynamic policy	Spatial placement	Single-lookup	Easy to use
Scratchpads	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Code hints	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
Cache replacement	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓
Private D-NUCA	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Shared D-NUCA	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Whirlpool	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Desirable properties achieved by prior memory system management techniques.

or compilers manage data placement and movement. But scratchpads are hard to use. Even with advanced compilers, only highly regular programs can use them well [41]. Scratchpads also do not support dynamic adaptation.

For these reasons, most memory systems use cache hierarchies instead. Caches are transparent by default, but programs can include various types of access hints such as software prefetch instructions and non-temporal hints to bypass the cache hierarchy [12, 14, 27, 48, 63]. However, these techniques embed specific static policies in the program, which may degrade performance.

The common drawback of these techniques is their lack of dynamism, which makes these optimizations risky: changes in workload behavior or system configuration may make these optimizations ineffective or detrimental to performance.

Techniques that work transparently: High-performance replacement policies often dynamically classify data and treat lines of each class differently. For example, RRIP [33] classifies lines as reused and non-reused; IbrDP [50] classifies them by the PC of their last memory access; and SHiP [65] classifies lines by PC or memory address.

Similarly, Whirlpool’s classification could also improve replacement decisions. We explored a Whirlpool-based replacement policy that extends DRRIP [33] to adapt insertion priority across pools (similar to TA-DRRIP [32, 33] and CAMP [49]). However, we found that the benefits from static classification within a monolithic cache were marginal: cache replacement is a simpler problem than data placement, and dynamic replacement policies like DRRIP and SHiP perform well at relatively low overhead. We therefore focus on the harder problem of NUCA data placement.

Dynamic NUCAs (D-NUCAs) try to reduce data movement by placing data near where it is used. These schemes can be broadly classified into two categories based on whether they start from a private or shared cache organization.

Private-baseline D-NUCAs treat the cache as a fine-grained hierarchy, accessing the closest banks first, then checking farther-away banks on a miss [6, 37, 68]. Upon a hit, these D-NUCAs move data closer to the accessing core, displacing other data further away, similar to how high-performance replacement policies promote lines upon reuse. Hence, over

time, private-baseline D-NUCAs gradually place frequently-used data nearby.

However, private-baseline D-NUCAs suffer from two problems. First, migrating data in response to each access increases overall data movement and wastes significant energy [7]. Second, since addresses do not have a known location, they also require complex lookup mechanisms (e.g., multi-level lookups, broadcasts, or directories) that add area, latency, and energy [6, 51, 68]. For example, schemes that use global directory lookups beyond the local cache bank would not reduce dt’s data movement for **vertices** or **triangles**—the majority of its data accesses. As a result, prior work has consistently shown that it is far more efficient to avoid moving data among banks in response to accesses [7, 9, 22, 28, 51].

Shared-baseline D-NUCAs [4, 9, 19, 28] leverage the virtual memory system to control data placement. A page’s location is tracked in software and infrequently updated in response to program behavior. Unlike private-baseline D-NUCAs, shared-baseline D-NUCAs can locate data in a single lookup and thereby avoid excessive data migration. However, they respond more slowly to changes in program behavior and must also place data at a page granularity.

We compare against schemes from each class: IdealSPD, an idealized private-baseline D-NUCA, and Awasthi et al. [4], a representative shared-baseline D-NUCA (see Appendix A).

Whirlpool achieves the advantages of the above techniques while minimizing their drawbacks. It leverages static, program-level data classification to achieve a good data placement without frequently migrating data, and it adapts to unpredictable run-time variability.


2.4 Jigsaw: Our baseline system

Whirlpool builds on Jigsaw, a partitioned, shared-baseline D-NUCA. We now briefly describe Jigsaw’s main features; please see prior work for details [8, 9, 11].

Virtual caches: Jigsaw builds *virtual caches* (VCs) by combining partitions of physical cache banks, as shown in Fig. 7a (colors represent VCs). Pages are mapped to a specific VC through the TLB. Jigsaw uses three kinds of VCs: each thread has a thread-private VC; all threads in the process share a process VC; and all threads in the system share a global VC. Pages start as private to the thread that allocates them, and are upgraded lazily: an access from another thread upgrades the page to the process VC, and an access from another process upgrades the page to the global VC.

To support Whirlpool, we extend Jigsaw to allow applications to define additional VCs and map pages to them.

Single-lookup accesses: Jigsaw stores the placement of each VC in a small structure called the *virtual cache translation buffer* (VTB). In Jigsaw, each core requires just 3 VTB entries (for its thread-private, process, and global VCs). Each VTB entry is essentially a configurable hash function that maps an address to its *unique location*—in Jigsaw, data does *not* migrate in response to accesses. Jigsaw thus provides



(a) Jigsaw groups bank partitions into virtual caches (VCs). (b) The VTB controls data placement across banks.

Figure 7: Overview of Jigsaw, our baseline NUCA system.

single-lookup accesses. The VTB controls data placement by dividing the access stream across banks, as shown in Fig. 7b.


Reconfigurations: A lightweight OS runtime periodically (every 25 ms in our implementation) reconfigures the cache, sizing and placing VCs to minimize data movement. It does so using a simple model of memory access time that accounts for both cache misses and cache access latency. To account for cache misses, Jigsaw monitors *miss rate curves*, i.e. miss rate vs. VC size [11, 52]. To account for cache access latency, Jigsaw uses the average latency to the closest cache banks needed for a given VC size. From these components, the total latency of a VC is simply the sum of VC access latency (access rate \times network and bank latency) and memory latency (miss rate \times miss penalty).¹

The runtime builds the total latency curves for each VC and uses them to partition cache capacity. Traditional cache partitioning schemes try to minimize cache misses and partition using miss rate curves [52, 55]. By using latency curves instead of miss rate curves [11], Jigsaw will not use cache banks when their reduction in miss rate does not offset their added network latency. For example, dt fits in half the cache banks, so the remaining banks are not used (Fig. 4).

Whirlpool chooses VC sizes identically to Jigsaw, with the only difference being that each memory pool gets its own VC. Fig. 8a shows the miss rate curves for dt, and Fig. 8b shows the latency curves and the sizes chosen for each VC: in this case, the full working set fits on cache, so Jigsaw chooses the sizes that minimize each VC’s total latency.

After sizing VCs, the reconfiguration algorithm places them in cache banks. We use Jigsaw’s trading placement algorithm [11], which initially places data using a simple, greedy heuristic, and then trades capacity between VCs to reduce data movement. The key idea is *access intensity*: lines that are accessed more frequently pay a larger penalty for poor placement, and should therefore be placed closer to cores that access them. Intensity is given as access rate per capacity, i.e. a VC’s access rate divided by its size (APKI per

¹ This simple model ignores memory-level parallelism, but we find it works well. Alternatively, we could model energy; this would penalize misses more and change tradeoffs somewhat.



(a) Miss rate curves. (b) Memory latency curves.

Figure 8: dt’s memory performance vs. VC size: (a) Last-level cache misses. (b) Cycles per instruction stalled on data.

MB). For example, the pools in dt are accessed at a similar rate, but since **points** is one-eighth the size of **triangles**, its access intensity is $8\times$ larger. Intensity essentially says how many accesses are affected by placing a chunk of capacity of fixed size, and it lets us compute if trading capacity between two VCs reduces data movement.

Jigsaw outperforms state-of-the-art D-NUCAs and adds small overheads [9, 11]. In hardware, Jigsaw adds less than 0.6% area overhead over LLC banks; in software, Jigsaw consumes less than 0.4% of system cycles. Whirlpool extends Jigsaw to support static classification of data into pools by building VCs for each pool. We make small modifications to Jigsaw to exploit opportunities presented by static classification, but do not modify its core hardware mechanisms or software reconfiguration runtime.

3. Whirlpool with Manual Classification

We now present the design of Whirlpool and explore how it reduces data movement by combining static, program-level classification with dynamic caching policies.

Whirlpool classifies data used by an application into different regions, which we call memory pools. Memory pools let Whirlpool manage data that has similar access patterns as a single entity. It is also the granularity at which Whirlpool gathers information to drive dynamic policies.

In this section, we present an interface that lets an application programmer create memory pools and tag data used by the application to different pools. We then explore how Whirlpool improves placement through case studies. In Sec. 4, we present a profiling framework that automatically classifies data into memory pools.

3.1 Application programming interface

In our implementation, a pool is an independent region of heap-allocated memory. Our memory allocator ensures that pages belong to exactly one pool (or none) at a time, so that we can use the virtual memory system to classify data into pools, as in Jigsaw.

The programmer creates a new memory pool by calling:

```
pool_t pool_create();
```

which returns an id for the newly created pool. To allocate size bytes of memory from the pool, the programmer calls:

```
void* pool_malloc(size_t size, pool_t pool_id);
```

Similarly, other variants like `pool_calloc`, `pool_realloc`, etc. augment the standard arguments with `pool_id`.

This API lets the programmer tune the application’s cache performance by providing high-level hints at memory allocation time. At first, it might seem to be a tedious task for the programmer to reason about the access patterns and cache locality of different data. However, we find it often suffices to identify a few prominent data regions and allocate them to different pools. Thus, only a few lines of code need to be modified to port applications manually to Whirlpool.

Table 2 shows the applications we have manually ported, their key data structures, and the lines of code changed. Overall, Whirlpool improves performance on these applications by 7.3% over Jigsaw and reduces data movement energy by 12%. Detailed results are presented in Sec. 4.

Application	Pools	Data structures	LOC
Breadth-first search	4	Vertices, edges, frontier, visited	16
Delaunay triangulation	3	Points, vertices, triangles	11
Maximal matching	3	Vertices, edges, result	13
Delaunay refinement	3	Vertices, triangles, misc	8
Maximal independent set	3	Vertices, edges, flags	13
Spanning forest	3	Union-find parents, output tree, input edges	13
Minimal spanning forest	3	Union-find parents, output tree, input edges	11
Convex hull	2	Points, hull array	10
401.bzip2	4	arr1, arr2, ftab, tt	43
470.lbm	2	Source and destination grids	21
429.mcf	2	Nodes and arcs	14
436.cactusADM	2	Pugh variables, staggered-leapfrog grid data	53

Table 2: Pools found manually in various applications, plus lines of code (LOC) modified while porting to Whirlpool.

3.2 Modifications to baseline system

System calls to manage VCs: We expose VCs to user-level programs with a few additional system calls: `sys_vc_alloc` allocates a user-level VC, returning its unique id; `sys_vc_free` deallocates an existing VC; and `sys_vc_tag` tags a range of pages with a user-level VC. We also modify `sys_mmap` to optionally tag new pages with a specific VC. These system calls perform the adequate checks to ensure safety (e.g., allowing each process to map pages only to its own user-level VCs).

Our allocator uses this low-level interface to map each pool to a different VC and tag pages from each pool with the right VC id. Our implementation is built on top of Doug Lea’s `malloc` [40], but other allocators could be used instead.

Support for more VCs per core: The baseline Jigsaw system supports 3 VTB entries per core for thread-private, process, and global VCs. To support user-level VCs, we add extra VTB entries and utility monitors (specifically, GMONs [11]). As we will see, supporting up to 4 pools is enough for most

programs. In the 4-core system, Whirlpool adds 6 KB in VTB entries and 24 KB of monitors, or 0.3% of cache area.

Bypassing VCs: Programs often have data structures that get negligible reuse in the cache, and it is more efficient for them to bypass the cache entirely [62]. Bypassing is particularly beneficial in Whirlpool, since its static classification helps accurately identify data that should be bypassed.

We therefore extend Jigsaw to support bypassing VCs. We add a bypass bit to each VTB entry. Bypassed VCs have no LLC space allocated, and their L2 misses go directly to main memory. Bypassing is allowed only if the VC is accessed by a single thread. Coherence is maintained by invalidating the VC in the LLC when it enters bypassing mode (extending Jigsaw’s existing reconfiguration mechanism [11]), and by invalidating the VC in the L2 when it exits bypassing mode. Finally, Jigsaw’s software runtime decides whether to bypass a VC by modifying the inputs to its existing partitioning algorithm. Specifically, it excludes cache access latency in its access latency model if the VC is allocated no space. With this trivial change, the partitioning algorithm will only allocate space to a VC when bypassing hurts performance (see below).

We evaluate both Jigsaw and Whirlpool with this optimization, but since Jigsaw does not separate data that gets reuse from data that does not, we find that VC bypassing is more useful in Whirlpool.

Other Jigsaw components are unmodified. In particular, the OS remains in charge of reconfiguring the cache, and the reconfiguration algorithm stays the same. Additional VCs add 0.2% of system cycles to reconfigurations.

3.3 Whirlpool case studies

We now present several case studies that show how Whirlpool adapts to various sources of variability.

Whirlpool benefits from bypassing: Whirlpool decides whether to bypass VCs by modifying the latency curve. Fig. 9 shows how this is done for the PBBS benchmark `mis` (maximal independent set). Whirlpool changes Jigsaw’s memory latency model to model bypassing for VCs accessed by a single thread. Specifically, the total latency curve at a VC size of zero excludes the cache access latency. This is the only change needed, as the partitioning algorithm will then only allocate space if doing so reduces data movement vs. bypassing.

`mis` has two pools, **vertices** and **edges**. **Vertices** cache well, but **edges** do not. Whirlpool gives the full cache to **vertices** and bypasses **edges**. This is only possible because of Whirlpool’s static classification, which quickly identifies **edges** so they can be bypassed. Jigsaw does not separate accesses to **vertices** and **edges**, so it cannot allocate capacity specifically to **vertices** and it must always check the cache to maintain coherence.

Fig. 10 analyzes `mis`’s performance, data movement energy, and LLC accesses. We compare Whirlpool against S-




Figure 9: *mis*'s memory performance vs. VC size. Vertices cache well, but edges are streaming. Whirlpool bypasses edges and gives the cache to vertices.

NUCA caches with LRU and DRRIP replacement; IdealSPD, an idealized private-baseline D-NUCA policy that is an upper-bound over several prior D-NUCAs; the shared-baseline, page-migration D-NUCA proposed by Awasthi et al. [4]; and Jigsaw, extended to support bypassing (see Appendix A).






Figure 10: Breakdown of *mis*'s performance, energy, and accesses for different caching schemes.

Whirlpool reduces data movement because its static classification lets it adopt the right policy for each pool. Whirlpool gives enough space to fit **vertices**, achieving a similar hit rate to DRRIP and thus reducing memory energy. It also immediately bypasses accesses to **edges**, *without first checking a cache bank*. This reduces network and cache bank energy significantly over the other policies. In contrast, IdealSPD checks multiple banks (nearby banks first, then remote banks), and thus consumes the most energy. Meanwhile, Awasthi gets stuck at a small capacity allocation, incurring more misses than the other schemes. (Although Awasthi performs poorly on *mis* and several other benchmarks, it outperforms S-NUCA and saves energy on average; see Sec. 4.) Whirlpool improves *mis*'s performance by 38% over Jigsaw and reduces data movement energy by 53%.

Whirlpool adapts to application phases: Unlike prior techniques that leverage static information through fixed policies, Whirlpool uses dynamic policies that can adapt to time-varying program behavior. Fig. 6 showed one example for the SPEC CPU2006 benchmark *1bm*; Fig. 11 shows another for the PBBS benchmark *refine* (Delaunay refinement).



(a) Cache allocations sorted vertically by distance.



(b) Latency curves at $\frac{1}{2}$ B cycles. (c) Latency curves at 1 B cycles.

Figure 11: *refine* has irregular phase changes. Whirlpool dynamically adapts its allocations and placement to retain the data structures that have reuse.

refine accesses two main data structures, **triangles** and **vertices**, as well as other miscellaneous data in the **misc** pool. For most of *refine*'s execution, its working set fits easily on chip (Fig. 11b). However, at irregular intervals, its behavior changes for roughly 100 M cycles: **vertices** becomes streaming, **triangles** starts fitting on cache, and **misc**'s working set increases substantially (Fig. 11c).

Whirlpool adapts to this unpredictable behavior, changing its allocations and placement to retain the data structures that cache best. Fig. 11a shows how Whirlpool allocates and places cache space for *refine*. Time is shown in cycles along the *x*-axis, and allocations are indicated by color along the *y*-axis. Additionally, allocations are sorted by distance from the core along the *y*-axis from bottom to top.

For most of *refine*'s execution, **triangles** and **misc** are given small allocations placed near the core, and **vertices** is given most of the remaining cache space. This placement minimizes data movement because it fits **vertices** in the cache, and accesses to **triangles** and **misc** miss quickly. In *refine*, bypassing **triangles** and **misc** is not advantageous (see Fig. 11b), but placing them nearby helps by reducing network traffic.

During phase changes, this pattern inverts: **vertices** is streaming and is given a small allocation placed near the core, and the remaining cache space is given to either **triangles** or **misc** (depending on whether **triangles** fits).

3.4 Whirlpool with parallel applications

In addition to reducing data movement in sequential applications, Whirlpool benefits parallel applications by running

tasks close to their data. Whirlpool makes small changes to task-parallel runtimes, letting it rapidly benefit many applications with minimal programmer burden.

Conventional work-stealing: Work-stealing [13] is the most widely-used scheduling technique for task-parallel programs. Each thread has a queue of ready tasks, to which it enqueues and dequeues work. When a thread runs out of work, it tries to steal tasks from a randomly-selected thread’s queue. Work-stealing makes task enqueues and dequeues cheap and achieves good load balance, but, over time, each core ends up accessing data used by many tasks, hurting locality. Since work-stealing causes poor reference locality, D-NUCAs alone cannot achieve a good data placement [11]. For example, as shown in Fig. 13, Jigsaw performs the same as S-NUCA because most data is accessed from multiple cores and mapped to the single process-level VC.

Partitioned work-stealing (PaWS): Inspired by prior work on locality-aware placement and stealing [11, 16, 67], we develop simple extensions to improve reference locality. We leverage that, in many applications, the data accessed by each task is known when the task is created. PaWS partitions program data evenly among cores, and enqueues tasks to the core that has its input data instead of the thread’s local queue, as shown in Fig. 12. PaWS also preferentially steals tasks from neighboring cores instead of at random.




Figure 12: Partitioned work-stealing (PaWS) in Whirlpool on a 16-core system. In PaWS, each core works on a partition of the input and preferentially steals tasks from nearby cores. Colors indicate affinity between tasks and data.

We evaluate PaWS on six memory-intensive applications from several benchmark suites: mergesort [57], delaunay [60], fft [26], pagerank [58], connectedComponents [5], and triangleCounting [5]. The first three use regular data structures that are trivial to evenly partition across cores. The last three are irregular graph algorithms, for which different partitionings can have a large impact on performance. We use METIS [35] to evenly partition their input graphs while minimizing the number of edges across partitions.

Fig. 13 shows that PaWS improves performance moderately over Jigsaw when running on a 16-core system (up to




Figure 13: Performance of S-NUCA, Jigsaw, Jigsaw with PaWS, and Whirlpool with PaWS on parallel applications.

19% on pagerank). Jigsaw + PaWS improves performance because locality improves in the private caches and more data remains in the thread-private VC for longer. However, over time, work-stealing still causes a large fraction of the data to be accessed from multiple cores, leading to poor data placement in Jigsaw (and other schemes, e.g. R-NUCA [28]).

Whirlpool with PaWS: Whirlpool makes it easy for PaWS to benefit from improved spatial placement in shared caches. We simply map data from each partition to a separate pool. Although load imbalance causes data to be accessed by multiple cores, each pool’s VC is still placed close to the cores that use it. As shown in Fig. 13, this results in much higher gains over Jigsaw: from 6.5% higher performance and 22% lower data movement energy on mergesort, to 67% higher performance and $2.6\times$ lower data movement energy on connectedComponents.

In summary, Whirlpool with PaWS dramatically improves the performance and efficiency of parallel programs. Moreover, it requires only small changes to existing schedulers, and retains a familiar and productive programming model.

4. WhirlTool: Automated Data Classification

While specifying pools manually gives full control to the programmer, modifying program code is not always practical. We now use the insights from Sec. 3 to design Whirl-

Tool, a profile-guided tool that automatically classifies data into pools. WhirlTool works on unmodified binaries, often matches and sometimes outperforms our manual classification, and introduces small overheads. WhirlTool is publicly available at <http://people.csail.mit.edu/sanchez>.




Figure 14: WhirlTool overview.

WhirlTool consists of three main components, shown in Fig. 14. First, the *WhirlTool profiler* tracks a program’s memory allocations and profiles their access patterns. Specifically, we sample their stack distance distributions at regular intervals. Second, the *WhirlTool analyzer* clusters allocations into pools using the profiled stack distributions. Third, the *WhirlTool runtime* replaces the default memory allocator and transparently maps each allocation to its assigned pool. Profiling and analysis are performed once (e.g., during compilation).

4.1 WhirlTool profiler

To limit profiling information, Whirlpool identifies memory allocations by their *callpoint*, and profiles all allocations from the same callpoint as a single entity. This heuristic is motivated by our experience in manually porting applications, where we observed that semantically different data tend to be allocated from different points. Specifically, we produce each callpoint id by walking the stack and hashing the last two return PCs.

WhirlTool profiles applications to gather the miss rate curve of each callpoint [24, 61], then uses a distance metric based on miss rate curves to cluster callpoints into a small number of pools (discussed below). The profiler periodically records miss rate curves for all callpoints, which is important to distinguish allocations that are similar on average but whose behavior varies over time (e.g., `lbn` in Sec. 2.2).

We implement the profiler as a Pintool [44], though we note that profiling could be done in Jigsaw hardware directly. We sample miss rate curves every 50 M instructions. This produces 200 KB–1.25 MB of data on our benchmarks. We train WhirlTool with short runs (e.g., using SPEC CPU2006 train input sets) by default. As we show in Sec. 4.4, WhirlTool is quite robust to input set changes.

4.2 WhirlTool analyzer

The *WhirlTool analyzer* progressively clusters callpoints into a small number of pools. Clustering uses a distance metric between pools that reflects *how many additional misses are incurred by clustering them*.

Distance metric: WhirlTool computes the distance between two pools by using their miss rate curves. First, WhirlTool

estimates the *combined miss rate curve*, i.e., the curve that would result if both pools were grouped. We have developed a simple method to compute this curve, presented in Appendix B. Second, WhirlTool computes the *partitioned miss rate curve*, i.e., the curve that results from partitioning capacity between both pools. This results in fewer misses than the combined curve, since partitioning favors the pool that uses the cache best.

In principle, we could find the optimal partitioning between both pools at every size, but in practice doing so is computationally expensive [9, 52]. Instead, we compute the convex hulls of each input miss rate curve (a linear-time operation [45]), and then partition the full capacity in a single pass using convex optimization (i.e., hill climbing). This performance could be practically realized by using partitioning within each VC to achieve convex performance [10].

On a single interval, we define the distance between two pools as the area between their combined and partitioned curves. Fig. 15 shows an example. We combine a cache-friendly pool (`m1`) with two other pools (`m2` and `m3`) in the left and right figures. In the left figure, both `m1` and `m2` cache well, so there is little penalty from combining them. This is reflected in the small difference between their **combined** and **partitioned** miss rate curves. However, in the right figure, `m3` does not cache well, and it thus interferes more with `m1`. Combining these pools is a bad idea, since doing so will add many unnecessary misses to `m1`. This is reflected in the larger difference between their **combined** and **partitioned** miss rate curves.




Figure 15: WhirlTool measures the distance between two pools as the additional misses incurred by combining the pools vs. partitioning them separately.

Finally, the distance between two pools is the sum of distances of their per-interval curves. This way, pools accessed in non-overlapping intervals have a small distance, even though they may have very distinct access patterns when active. This benefits programs that use different data over distinct phases, as they can use a small number of pools without degradation.

Agglomerative clustering: WhirlTool uses a simple algorithm to cluster callpoints into pools. It first places each callpoint in a separate pool, and computes the pairwise distances




Figure 16: Speedup of WhirlTool over Jigsaw with 2, 3, and 4 pools. A red dot shows the performance achieved by manual classification for the applications we ported by hand (Table 2).




Figure 17: Hierarchical clustering with WhirlTool. Each graph shows the distance (x -axis) among callpoints and clusters (y -axis). Colors indicate how WhirlTool clusters callpoints into 3 pools.

between all pools. Then it proceeds iteratively. Each iteration merges the two closest pools, and computes the distance of the resulting pool to all the remaining pools. The result is a hierarchical clustering that gives the callpoint-to-pool mapping for different numbers of desired pools, as shown in Fig. 17. This procedure takes $O(n^2)$ time with n callpoints, but we find the runtime acceptable (a few seconds) for the applications we evaluate, which have 10s-100s of callpoints. In most applications, we observed that 2-4 pools suffice to capture most of the benefits of Whirlpool (Sec. 4.4).

4.3 WhirlTool runtime

WhirlTool’s runtime replaces the system’s memory allocator. On each allocation call, the tool finds the callpoint id and calls the Whirlpool allocator with the corresponding pool. Allocations from an unprofiled callpoint use the thread-private pool. This instrumentation incurs small overheads, at most 0.01% over all our benchmarks (some of which have frequent allocations).

4.4 WhirlTool analysis

Sensitivity to the number of pools: Fig. 16 shows how WhirlTool’s performance changes with the number of pools. Each group of bars show the performance of a specific application over Jigsaw. Each bar in the group shows performance for a given number of pools, from 2 to 4. We include SPEC CPU2006 and single-threaded PBBS applications running with their largest input sets. WhirlTool uses profiling data from the train input sets for SPEC CPU2006 and the small

input sets for PBBS applications. For manually-ported applications (Sec. 3), a dot shows the number of pools used by manual classification (x -axis) and the performance it achieves (y -axis). As we can see, performance improves by 5-15% for several applications, and `mis` is 38% faster.

In general, moving from 2 to 3 pools improves performance somewhat on a few applications, while 4 pools shows negligible improvements. Some applications (e.g., `gcc`, `soplex`) show a slight decrease in performance with more pools. This happens because these applications have significant variability, and partitioning their data more finely makes phase changes somewhat worse. Given these results, we consider 3 pools to be the right tradeoff, and use 3 pools in subsequent results.

WhirlTool vs. manual classification: Fig. 16 also shows that WhirlTool matches the performance of manual classification for most applications, and outperforms it in some cases (e.g., `bzip2`). Only `cactus` performs slightly worse with automatic classification.

Sensitivity to training data: WhirlTool’s performance is robust across input sets on most applications. To quantify this, we compare WhirlTool’s performance when using the default training input sets (`train/small`) for profiling vs. the full input sets used in our experiments (`ref/large`). WhirlTool’s performance is only significantly different in 4 out of the 31 applications, shown in Fig. 18. In these applications, the training inputs result in lower performance than when using the full inputs, e.g. by 5.5% for `leslie` and by 6.7% for `omnet`. This happens because the training inputs exhibit different access patterns than the full inputs. However, over all benchmarks WhirlTool is robust to different inputs, yielding just 0.4% lower performance on training inputs.




Figure 18: WhirlTool’s sensitivity to training inputs.

4.5 WhirlTool evaluation

Fig. 19 and Fig. 20 give two examples of how WhirlTool achieves similar benefits to manual classification.




Figure 19: Breakdown of cactus’s performance, energy, and accesses for different caching schemes.

cactus has two memory regions, only one of which gets good reuse. WhirlTool correctly identifies these pools, letting Whirlpool cache the former near the core and bypass the latter (Fig. 19). Meanwhile, Jigsaw cannot distinguish between pools and must use more cache banks to retain the working set. As a result, Whirlpool significantly reduces network traffic over Jigsaw, and reduces overall data movement energy by 42%. Reducing network traffic also reduces network latency, and Whirlpool improves performance over Jigsaw by 8.6%.




Figure 20: Breakdown of SA’s performance, energy, and accesses for different caching schemes.

SA offers an interesting contrast. Rather than using fewer banks to reduce network latency over Jigsaw, Whirlpool uses more banks to reduce cache misses (Fig. 20). WhirlTool identifies the pools in SA that cache well, and Whirlpool can thus retain more of the working set and reduce main memory accesses. But in order to do so, it uses more banks—which can be seen in the higher network energy. Overall, this is a good tradeoff, and Whirlpool reduces data movement energy by 15% over Jigsaw while improving performance by 7.3%.

Single-threaded applications: We now extend these case studies across many benchmarks. Fig. 21 compares Whirlpool’s overall performance and data movement energy with S-NUCA, IdealSPD, Awasthi et al., and Jigsaw over the 31 memory-intensive applications from SPEC CPU2006 and PBBS.




Figure 21: Breakdown of overall performance, energy, and accesses for different caching schemes across all single-threaded benchmarks.

Individual applications see large improvements, e.g., up to 53% lower data movement energy and 38% speedup in mis. However, average gains are more muted: Whirlpool reduces data movement energy over Jigsaw by 8.0%, and improves performance by 3.9%. As currently coded, many applications do not expose their memory access heterogeneity across different address regions. With more careful coding, WhirlTool may be able to extract more heterogeneity and improve performance further. As shown in Fig. 21, Whirlpool achieves this by (a) placing data closer, which reduces network energy and latency, (b) caching data that is more likely to hit, and (c) bypassing more selectively than Jigsaw. By contrast, S-NUCA with LRU incurs 51% more data movement energy than Whirlpool and 15% worse performance; S-NUCA with DRIP incurs 50% more data movement energy and 14% worse performance; IdealSPD incurs 54% more data movement energy and 18% worse performance; and Awasthi incurs 40% more data movement energy and 15% worse performance. However, while S-NUCA variants are generally slower, IdealSPD has a more bimodal behavior: it performs close to Jigsaw on benchmarks that fit within its private region (e.g., `bzip2`), but performs the worst of all schemes on benchmarks that do not fit due to unnecessary multi-level lookups that slow down misses and add data movement energy. Similarly, Awasthi performs much better than S-NUCA on benchmarks with small working sets, but performs poorly on benchmarks that need more than four cache banks (Awasthi’s initial allocation). As a result, Awasthi significantly reduces network latency and energy but incurs more misses than S-NUCA.

Fig. 21 also shows that, while Whirlpool and Jigsaw both benefit from bypassing, Whirlpool benefits more because it can distinguish and bypass pools with no reuse. Without bypassing, Jigsaw is 0.2% slower, while Whirlpool is 1.2% slower.

Multi-programmed mixes: We run 20 mixes of randomly-chosen, memory-intensive SPEC CPU2006 applications, at both 4 and 16 cores. Fig. 22 shows the distribution of weighted speedups in both cases. Each line shows the weighted speedup of a single scheme over the Jigsaw baseline,

sorted along workload mixes (x -axis) by improvement (inverse CDF). Whirlpool outperforms Jigsaw by up to 13% at 4 cores (5.1% gmean), by up to 6.4% at 16 cores (3.0% gmean), and improves performance consistently. Improvements are larger with fewer cores because, with more applications, Jigsaw has many choices to improve cache performance even with a single VC per application.




Figure 22: Weighted speedup of Whirlpool over Jigsaw for 4- and 16-core systems.

Other schemes perform considerably worse. On 4- and 16-core mixes, Whirlpool outperforms S-NUCA by 32%/62% respectively, DRRIP by 25%/52%, IdealSPD by 30%/50%, and Awasthi by 18%/25%. This is because Jigsaw gathers detailed information about each VC over all possible allocations, allowing it to carefully optimize data placement at each reconfiguration.

5. Additional Related Work

Awasthi et al. [4] propose a D-NUCA scheme that uses page coloring to periodically migrate a few most heavily accessed pages to nearby banks. The scheme uses simple hardware extensions and an OS runtime, similar to Whirlpool. Because Awasthi manages individual pages, it doesn’t require tagging pools. But per-page monitoring also limits the information Awasthi can gather, and it therefore places pages incrementally using a simple heuristic that can get stuck in local optima (see Fig. 9). In contrast, Whirlpool monitors pools in detail, models end-to-end latency, and performs full reconfigurations, achieving lower AMAT.

SLIP [22] is an insertion policy for single-core NUCAs that seeks to minimize data movement energy. SLIP samples per-page reuse distance distributions, stores them in main memory, and uses an energy optimization unit to decide where to insert lines from different pages. Unlike Jigsaw and Whirlpool, SLIP does not extend to chips with multiple, distributed cores. SLIP also incurs significant storage and logic overheads to decide how far away to insert cache lines at runtime, as it performs very fine-grained (per-page) classification. Instead, Whirlpool relies on distinguishing among the few main classes of data in the program, which makes online adaptation inexpensive.

Cores	4/16 cores, x86-64 ISA, Nehalem-like OOO, 2 GHz [56]
L1 caches	32 KB, 8-way set-associative, split D/I, 4-cycle latency
L2 caches	128 KB private per-core, 8-way set-associative, inclusive, 6-cycle latency
L3 cache	512 KB per bank, 4-way 52-candidate zcache [54], 9 cycle bank latency
Coherence protocol	MESI, 64 B lines, in-cache directory, no silent drops; sequential consistency
NUCA NoC	5×5/9×9 mesh, 128-bit flits and links, X-Y routing, 3-cycle pipelined routers, 2-cycle links
Memory	1/4 MCUs, 1 channel/MCU, 120 cycles zero-load latency, 12.8 GB/s per channel

Table 3: Configuration of the simulated 16-core CMP.

Recent work has studied page placement for systems with heterogeneous and non-uniform main memory (NUMA) [1, 23, 69]. NUMA techniques also have different goals and constraints than NUCA: main memory is larger and has significantly lower bandwidth, so these designs primarily seek to balance bandwidth over network distance and capacity, and reconfigurations are much more infrequent. Agarwal et al. [2] propose an API that lets programmers give hints on whether allocated memory should be placed in bandwidth- or capacity-optimized memory. Unlike this work, Whirlpool includes a fully-automatic variant and places data dynamically.

6. Conclusions

We have presented Whirlpool, a classification-based approach to manage distributed caches. Whirlpool statically classifies data into different pools, which allows dynamic policies to tune the cache to each pool. Unlike prior work, Whirlpool conveys semantic, application-level information about memory usage without fixing the caching policy. We have presented a simple API that allows programmers to classify data, and a profiling tool that works in unmodified binaries and achieves similar performance to manual classification. By leveraging this rich information, Whirlpool significantly outperforms prior work.

A. Experimental Methodology

We perform microarchitectural, execution-driven simulation using zsim [56]. We simulate systems with 4 and 16 OOO cores with parameters in Table 3. The 4-core system has a NUCA cache with 5×5 with 512 KB banks (3.1 MB/core), as shown in Fig. 1. The 16-core system has 9×9 banks (2.5 MB/core), as shown in Fig. 12. We compute data movement (uncore) energy using McPAT 1.1 [42] at 22 nm for caches and NoC, and Micron DDR3L datasheets [46] for main memory. Additionally, we evaluated systems with stream prefetchers: Whirlpool’s performance relative to other schemes is unchanged. We do not include prefetchers because they add undesirable data movement energy, especially in mixes.

We compare Whirlpool with D-NUCA and S-NUCA configurations. Jigsaw and Whirlpool both use latency-aware capacity allocation and trading data placement [11]. For private-baseline D-NUCAs, we model an idealized shared-private D-NUCA scheme, IdealSPD, which we grant additional capacity. In IdealSPD, each core has a private 1.5 MB L3 that replicates the 3 closest NUCA banks, followed by a fully-provisioned directory and an exclusive, S-NUCA L4. L4 banks act as a victim cache and are accessed in parallel with the directory to minimize latency. IdealSPD upper-bounds D-NUCA schemes that partition the LLC between private and shared regions, as private (L3) regions do not reduce the capacity of the shared (L4) region. Herrero et al. [30] show that this idealized scheme *always* outperforms several state-of-the-art private-baseline D-NUCA schemes that include shared-private partitioning, selective replication, and adaptive spilling (DCC [29], ASR [6], and ECC [30]), often significantly (up to 30%). For shared-baseline D-NUCAs, we compare against Awasthi et al. [4], discussed in Sec. 5. We have implemented Awasthi as proposed, sweeping implementation parameters α_A , α_B to find the values that perform best. Other shared-baseline D-NUCAs use placement heuristics that compare unfavorably to Awasthi and Whirlpool; e.g., R-NUCA [28] achieves 6.8%/7.2% lower performance than Awasthi on 4-/16-core mixes of SPEC CPU2006.

We use SPEC CPU2006 and PBBS [60] apps. In single-program experiments, SPEC apps are executed for 10 B instructions after fast-forwarding 20 B instructions, and PBBS apps are fast-forwarded to the start of their region of interest, and run for the full region. We consider the applications with >5 L2 MPKI: 15 from SPEC CPU2006 (bzip2, gcc, mcf, milc, zeusmp, cactusADM, leslie3d, soplex, GemsFDTD, libquantum, lbm, astar, omnetpp, sphinx3, and xalanbmk) and 16 from PBBS (all but nbody).

We also simulate mixes of single-threaded SPEC CPU2006 apps, using a fixed-work methodology similar to prior work [9, 31, 33]: we run random mixes with 1 B instructions per app after fast-forwarding for 20 B instructions. All apps are kept running until all finish 1 B instructions, and we only consider the first 1 B instructions of each app.

B. Modeling Combined Miss Rate Curves

As discussed in Sec. 4, WhirlTool’s distance metric needs to estimate the combined miss rate curve of several callpoints. Several prior models predict shared cache interference [15, 17, 25, 66], but these are somewhat complex and computationally expensive. We instead develop a simpler model that lets WhirlTool rapidly estimate the effect of combining pools.

We model the combined miss rate curve using the *flow* of lines through the cache. For simplicity, consider LRU replacement. The idea behind flow is that lines enter the cache at MRU, and are pushed towards LRU by other lines entering the cache, until they are eventually evicted. Flow is the rate that lines are being pushed towards LRU. However,


flow is not constant—hits promote lines rather than evicting them, so flow decreases as lines hit (see Fig. 23). Hence, *the flow at a given point in the miss rate curve is equal to the miss rate at that size*.

Flow is useful because it gives a simple way to combine miss rate curves: when two pools are merged, accesses from either pool push lines from both pools towards LRU. In other words, flow is additive. But the rate at which lines are pushed depends on both their fraction of flow—infrequently-accessed pools have little effect on the combined miss rate curve—and how far they have already been pushed. Listing 1 gives pseudocode for the model.

```
def combineMissCurves(m1, m2):
    s1, s2 = 0, 0
    for s = 0 to N:
        m[s] = m1[s1] + m2[s2]
        s1 += m1[s1] / m[s]
        s2 += m2[s2] / m[s]
    return m
```

Listing 1: Simple model for combining miss rate curves.

One way to think about this model is that it has a single “write head” at s and two “read heads” at $s1$ and $s2$. At each step, it writes m by reading the input miss rate curves at $m1$ and $m2$, then moves the read heads through their input curves according to their relative flows. Fig. 23a shows an example.



(a) Combining $m1$ and $m2$. (b) Combining similar pools.

Figure 23: WhirlTool’s simple model to combine miss rate curves.

This model has several desirable properties. It is commutative and associative, so the order in which pools are combined does not matter. It will correctly recombine similar access patterns into a similar result, so the model is insensitive to arbitrary divisions of single pool into subpools (see Fig. 23b). It also produces small changes when adding a pool that is accessed infrequently.

Acknowledgments

We thank Harshad Kasture, Suvinay Subramanian, Po-An Tsai, Xiaosong Ma, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback. This work was supported in part by NSF grants CCF-1318384 and CAREER-1452994, and by a Samsung GRO award.

References

- [1] N. Agarwal, D. Nellans, M. O'Connor, S. W. Keckler, and T. F. Wenisch, "Unlocking bandwidth for GPUs in CC-NUMA systems," in *Proc. HPCA-21*, 2015.
- [2] N. Agarwal, D. Nellans, M. Stephenson, M. O'Connor, and S. W. Keckler, "Page Placement Strategies for GPUs within Heterogeneous Memory Systems," in *Proc. ASPLOS-XX*, 2015.
- [3] K. Aingaran, D. Smentek, T. Wicki, S. Jairath, G. Konstadinidis, S. Leung *et al.*, "M7: Oracle's Next-Generation Sparc Processor," *IEEE Micro*, no. 2, 2015.
- [4] M. Awasthi, K. Sudan, R. Balasubramonian, and J. Carter, "Dynamic hardware-assisted software-controlled page placement to manage capacity allocation and sharing within large caches," in *Proc. HPCA-15*, 2009.
- [5] S. Beamer, K. Asanović, and D. Patterson, "The GAP benchmark suite," *arXiv:1508.03619 [cs.DC]*, 2015.
- [6] B. M. Beckmann, M. R. Marty, and D. A. Wood, "ASR: Adaptive selective replication for CMP caches," in *Proc. MICRO-39*, 2006.
- [7] B. M. Beckmann and D. A. Wood, "Managing wire delay in large chip-multiprocessor caches," in *Proc. MICRO-37*, 2004.
- [8] N. Beckmann, "Design and analysis of spatially-partitioned shared caches," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015.
- [9] N. Beckmann and D. Sanchez, "Jigsaw: Scalable software-defined caches," in *Proc. PACT-22*, 2013.
- [10] N. Beckmann and D. Sanchez, "Talus: A Simple Way to Remove Cliffs in Cache Performance," in *Proc. HPCA-21*, 2015.
- [11] N. Beckmann, P.-A. Tsai, and D. Sanchez, "Scaling Distributed Cache Hierarchies through Computation and Data Co-Scheduling," in *Proc. HPCA-21*, 2015.
- [12] K. Beyls and E. D'Hollander, "Generating cache hints for improved program efficiency," *J. Syst. Architect.*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2005.
- [13] R. D. Blumofe and C. E. Leiserson, "Scheduling multithreaded computations by work stealing," *J. ACM*, vol. 46, no. 5, 1999.
- [14] J. Brock, X. Gu, B. Bao, and C. Ding, "Pacman: Program-assisted cache management," in *Proc. ISMM*, 2013.
- [15] D. Chandra, F. Guo, S. Kim, and Y. Solihin, "Predicting inter-thread cache contention on a chip multi-processor architecture," in *Proc. HPCA-11*, 2005.
- [16] Q. Chen, M. Guo, and H. Guan, "LAWS: locality-aware work-stealing for multi-socket multi-core architectures," in *Proc. ICS*, 2014.
- [17] X. E. Chen and T. M. Aamodt, "A first-order fine-grained multithreaded throughput model," in *Proc. HPCA-15*, 2009.
- [18] Z. Chishty, M. D. Powell, and T. Vijaykumar, "Optimizing replication, communication, and capacity allocation in CMPs," in *Proc. ISCA-32*, 2005.
- [19] S. Cho and L. Jin, "Managing distributed, shared L2 caches through OS-level page allocation," in *Proc. MICRO-39*, 2006.
- [20] S. Coleman and K. S. McKinley, "Tile size selection using cache organization and data layout," in *Proc. PLDI*, 1995.
- [21] W. J. Dally, "GPU Computing: To Exascale and Beyond," in *Supercomputing '10, Plenary Talk*, 2010.
- [22] S. Das, T. M. Aamodt, and W. J. Dally, "SLIP: reducing wire energy in the memory hierarchy," in *Proc. ISCA-42*, 2015.
- [23] M. Dashti, A. Fedorova, J. Funston, F. Gaud, R. Lachaize, B. Lepers *et al.*, "Traffic management: a holistic approach to memory placement on NUMA systems," in *Proc. ASPLOS-XVIII*, 2013.
- [24] C. Ding and Y. Zhong, "Predicting whole-program locality through reuse distance analysis," in *Proc. PLDI*, 2003.
- [25] D. Eklov, D. Black-Schaffer, and E. Hagersten, "StatCC: a statistical cache contention model," in *Proc. PACT-19*, 2010.
- [26] M. Frigo, C. E. Leiserson, and K. H. Randall, "The Implementation of the Cilk-5 Multithreaded Language," in *Proc. PLDI*, 1998.
- [27] X. Gu, T. Bai, Y. Gao, C. Zhang, R. Archambault, and C. Ding, "P-OPT: Program-directed optimal cache management," in *Proc. LCPC-21*, 2008.
- [28] N. Hardavellas, M. Ferdman, B. Falsafi, and A. Ailamaki, "Reactive NUCA: near-optimal block placement and replication in distributed caches," in *Proc. ISCA-36*, 2009.
- [29] E. Herrero, J. González, and R. Canal, "Distributed cooperative caching," in *Proc. PACT-17*, 2008.
- [30] E. Herrero, J. González, and R. Canal, "Elastic cooperative caching: an autonomous dynamically adaptive memory hierarchy for chip multiprocessors," in *Proc. ISCA-37*, 2010.
- [31] A. Hilton, N. Eswaran, and A. Roth, "FIESTA: A sample-balanced multi-program workload methodology," *Proc. MoBS*, 2009.
- [32] A. Jaleel, W. Hasenplaugh, M. Qureshi, J. Sebot, S. Steely Jr, and J. Emer, "Adaptive insertion policies for managing shared caches," in *Proc. PACT-17*, 2008.
- [33] A. Jaleel, K. B. Theobald, S. C. Steely Jr, and J. Emer, "High performance cache replacement using re-reference interval prediction (RRIP)," in *Proc. ISCA-37*, 2010.
- [34] N. P. Jouppi, "Improving direct-mapped cache performance by the addition of a small fully-associative cache and prefetch buffers," in *Proc. ISCA-17*, 1990.
- [35] G. Karypis and V. Kumar, "A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs," *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1998.
- [36] S. W. Keckler, W. J. Dally, B. Khailany, M. Garland, and D. Glasco, "GPUs and the future of parallel computing," *IEEE Micro*, no. 5, 2011.
- [37] C. Kim, D. Burger, and S. W. Keckler, "An adaptive, non-uniform cache structure for wire-delay dominated on-chip caches," in *Proc. ASPLOS-X*, 2002.
- [38] R. Komuravelli, M. D. Sinclair, M. Kotsifakou, P. Srivastava, S. V. Adve, and V. S. Adve, "Stash: Have your scratchpad and cache it too," in *Proc. ISCA-42*, 2015.
- [39] M. D. Lam, E. E. Rothberg, and M. E. Wolf, "The cache performance and optimizations of blocked algorithms," in *Proc. ASPLOS-IV*, 1991.

- [40] D. Lea, "A memory allocator," <http://gee.cs.oswego.edu/dl/html/malloc.html>, 2000.
- [41] J. Leverich, H. Arakida, A. Solomatnikov, A. Firoozshahian, M. Horowitz, and C. Kozyrakis, "Comparing memory systems for chip multiprocessors," in *Proc. ISCA-34*, 2007.
- [42] S. Li, J. H. Ahn, R. D. Strong, J. B. Brockman, D. M. Tullsen, and N. P. Jouppi, "McPAT: an integrated power, area, and timing modeling framework for multicore and manycore architectures," in *Proc. MICRO-42*, 2009.
- [43] J. Lira, C. Molina, and A. González, "LRU-PEA: A smart replacement policy for non-uniform cache architectures on chip multiprocessors," in *Proc. ICCD*, 2009.
- [44] C.-K. Luk, R. Cohn, R. Muth, H. Patil, A. Klauser, G. Lowney *et al.*, "Pin: building customized program analysis tools with dynamic instrumentation," in *Proc. PLDI*, 2005.
- [45] A. A. Melkman, "On-line construction of the convex hull of a simple polyline," *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 25, no. 1, 1987.
- [46] Micron, "1.35V DDR3L power calculator (4Gb x16 chips)," 2013.
- [47] T. C. Mowry, M. S. Lam, and A. Gupta, "Design and evaluation of a compiler algorithm for prefetching," in *Proc. ASPLOS-V*, 1992.
- [48] S. Palanca, V. Pentkovski, S. Tsai, and S. Maiyuran, "Method and apparatus for implementing non-temporal stores," 2001, US Patent 6,205,520.
- [49] G. Pekhimenko, T. Huberty, R. Cai, O. Mutlu, P. B. Gibbons, M. Kozuch *et al.*, "Exploiting compressed block size as an indicator of future reuse," in *Proc. HPCA-21*, 2015.
- [50] P. Petoumenos, G. Keramidas, and S. Kaxiras, "Instruction-based reuse-distance prediction for effective cache management," in *Proc. SAMOS*, 2009.
- [51] M. K. Qureshi, "Adaptive spill-recv for robust high-performance caching in CMPs," in *Proc. HPCA-15*, 2009.
- [52] M. K. Qureshi and Y. N. Patt, "Utility-based cache partitioning: A low-overhead, high-performance, runtime mechanism to partition shared caches," in *Proc. MICRO-39*, 2006.
- [53] S. Rusu, H. Muljono, D. Ayers, S. Tam, W. Chen, A. Martin *et al.*, "Ivytown: A 22nm 15-core enterprise Xeon® processor family," in *Proc. ISSCC*, 2014.
- [54] D. Sanchez and C. Kozyrakis, "The ZCache: Decoupling ways and associativity," in *Proc. MICRO-43*, 2010.
- [55] D. Sanchez and C. Kozyrakis, "Vantage: Scalable and efficient fine-grain cache partitioning," in *Proc. ISCA-38*, 2011.
- [56] D. Sanchez and C. Kozyrakis, "ZSim: fast and accurate microarchitectural simulation of thousand-core systems," in *Proc. ISCA-40*, 2013.
- [57] D. Sanchez, R. M. Yoo, and C. Kozyrakis, "Flexible architectural support for fine-grain scheduling," in *Proc. ASPLOS-XV*, 2010.
- [58] N. Satish, N. Sundaram, M. M. A. Patwary, J. Seo, J. Park, M. A. Hassaan *et al.*, "Navigating the maze of graph analytics frameworks using massive graph datasets," in *Proc. SIGMOD*, 2014.
- [59] J. Shalf, S. Dosanjh, and J. Morrison, "Exascale computing technology challenges," in *Proc. High Performance Computing for Computational Science (VECPAR)*, 2010.
- [60] J. Shun, G. E. Blelloch, J. T. Fineman, P. B. Gibbons, A. Kyrola, H. V. Simhadri *et al.*, "Brief announcement: the problem based benchmark suite," in *Proc. SPAA*, 2012.
- [61] D. K. Tam, R. Azimi, L. B. Soares, and M. Stumm, "RapidMRC: approximating L2 miss rate curves on commodity systems for online optimizations," in *Proc. ASPLOS-XIV*, 2009.
- [62] G. Tyson, M. Farrens, J. Matthews, and A. R. Pleszkun, "A modified approach to data cache management," in *Proc. MICRO-28*, 1995.
- [63] Z. Wang, K. McKinley, A. L. Rosenberg, and C. C. Weems, "Using the compiler to improve cache replacement decisions," in *Proc. PACT-11*, 2002.
- [64] M. E. Wolf and M. S. Lam, "A data locality optimizing algorithm," in *Proc. PLDI*, 1991.
- [65] C.-J. Wu, A. Jaleel, W. Hasenplaugh, M. Martonosi, S. C. Steely Jr, and J. Emer, "SHiP: signature-based hit predictor for high performance caching," in *Proc. MICRO-44*, 2011.
- [66] X. Xiang, B. Bao, C. Ding, and Y. Gao, "Linear-time modeling of program working set in shared cache," in *Proc. PACT-20*, 2011.
- [67] R. M. Yoo, C. J. Hughes, C. Kim, Y.-K. Chen, and C. Kozyrakis, "Locality-aware task management for unstructured parallelism: A quantitative limit study," in *Proc. SPAA*, 2013.
- [68] M. Zhang and K. Asanovic, "Victim replication: Maximizing capacity while hiding wire delay in tiled chip multiprocessors," in *Proc. ISCA-32*, 2005.
- [69] S. Zhuravlev, S. Blagodurov, and A. Fedorova, "Addressing shared resource contention in multicore processors via scheduling," in *Proc. ASPLOS-XV*, 2010.