

Harvesting L2 Caches in Server Processors

Majid Jalili, and Mattan Erez
The University of Texas at Austin
{majid,mattan.erez}@utexas.edu

Abstract—We make three observations in modern processors: (1) LLC capacity is getting larger (up to 1GB); (2) core counts are increasing (up to 128 cores), accumulating a more significant amount of private L2 cache capacity on the chip; and (3) overall processor utilization in the cloud remains very low despite many efforts, leaving many large private caches unused. To enable better use of these beefy processors, we propose to open up a logical path for LLC evictions to unused private caches. In other words, instead of writing LLC evictions to slow and busy main memory, we send some of them that are still alive up to idle L2 caches to avoid unnecessary long and costly main memory. Our scheme takes the importance of applications (user-facing vs. background), and system load into account to provide each application with a fair share of idle resources. Our results show that we can improve system performance by up to $2\times$ (geomean of 10%) for single-application runs. Also, for mixes of user-facing and background jobs, our scheme improves the P99 latency of user-facing tasks by up to 32% (geomean of 15%), and the IPC of background jobs by up to 50% (geomean of 10%).

I. INTRODUCTION

CPU manufacturers are increasing the L2/LLC sizes and number of cores to respond to the ever-increasing demand for computation. For instance, comparing two high-end Intel processors (Xeon Platinum 8180 and Xeon Platinum 8380), we observe that total cache capacity has increased from 66.5MB to 110MB. AMD processors also follow a similar trends: EPYC-7773X has 800MB on-chip memory with 64 cores. At the same time, these CPUs are operating at very low utilization, 40% at Azure [10], and 20-50% at Alibaba [13]. This shift toward deeper and larger caches combined with low utilization opens opportunities for novel cache management mechanisms.

We propose L2 Harvester (L2H), a completely software-transparent scheme built on top of the current rigid memory hierarchy that harvests idle cache resources, reducing the average load latency by up to 30%. L2H moves a fraction of LLC capacity/conflict evictions to unused private L2 caches instead of writing them back to main memory. Thus, later L2 misses can find data in other L2 caches, reducing off-chip transactions. L2H has the benefits of the classic memory hierarchy such as software transparency, simplicity of design, and isolation, while increasing cache utilization.

Prior work has examined different techniques to address cache underutilization. Figure 1(a) displays OS-managed schemes, such as Jenga [36] and IBM Z16 [3], where the cache hierarchy is flattened and an allocator determines eviction placement, adding significant complexity to design. Figure 1(b) presents the virtual victim cache [19], which aims to accommodate evictions in different sets. However, imbalancing other LLC sets exacerbates performance variation, particularly




Fig. 1. Comparing L2 Harvester to other solutions.

in cloud environments where predictability is critical to meeting service-level agreements. Figure 1(c) depicts DSR [27] and CC [9], which redirect evictions to other private caches rather than to LLC or DRAM. However, DSR’s heuristics require transferring cache miss statistics from all caches for each eviction, resulting in a substantial increase in network traffic. Moreover, DSR does not differentiate between dead or live blocks during eviction swapping, resulting in unnecessary traffic.

We revisit DSR [27], and address its shortcomings, including the need for transferring cache miss statistics, the blind accommodation of evictions, and extend it to a 3-level cache hierarchy. In L2 Harvester, on LLC evictions, we predict if the block is not dead and will be accessed soon. If so, the block is sent to a load balancer to decide if there is any idle core. Upon finding an available L2 cache, the block is written to the lender L2 cache, and the snoop filter metadata is updated as normal. Later, if a request to this block is received, the lender cache responds and satisfies the request. Note that L2H relies on the current coherence mechanism to locate the cache block, and does not need any special support from the hardware or runtime system, thus it is superior to designs such as Jenga [36] and IBM Z16 [3].

L2H utilizes two lightweight predictors to find the dead blocks: (1) a bloom filter-based predictor that tracks recently evicted addresses, identifying those misses that could have been avoided with a larger cache; and (2) MPPP [17]: a perceptron-based dead block predictor that combines different features such as address and program counter to predict if a block has exhausted its useful lifetime. The two predictors complement each other: MPPP covers the bloom filter when it is not warmed up, and the bloom filter makes up for the MPPP sensitivity to thresholds when the system load is high.

We consult both predictors and make our decision based on a simple algorithm: if the load in the system is high, both

predictors should agree if a block is not dead in order for the block to be sent up to a private L2 cache. If the load is low, the block is sent up if either predicts the block is not dead.

We take into account the importance and criticality of applications being run to give them a fair share of private L2 caches. User-facing applications maximally use the extra cache space as they have the highest priority in the system. Background jobs can also get extra space if the load balancer detects that the user-facing applications are not cache-sensitive, and can yield the extra space.

We evaluate L2H under different utilization scenarios. First, when the CPU load is very low (<25%) and running one application. This allows the application to take up all private L2 caches in the system, representing the upper-bound benefit of L2H. Then, we move to more complex scenarios where a mix of critical and background jobs are run. L2H must make decisions regarding what blocks are dead and how to split the private L2 caches.

We implement L2H in gem5 [22] and run applications from different domains (datacenter, scientific, and graph analytics). Our experimental result shows that for a single application with multiple lenders, we improve P99 latency by 2 $\times$. Also, for mixes of user-facing and background jobs, L2H improves P99 and throughput by up to 32% and 50%.

To summarize our main contributions:

- We demonstrate that a substantial amount of cache capacity is wasted in modern processors due to a rigid hierarchal design, and conservative resource allocation in the cloud.
- We architect and evaluate an effective, yet low-cost L2 harvesting mechanism that enables a logical path from LLC evictions to private L2 caches. This allows the idle cores to lend their unused L2 caches, thus keeping more data blocks on the chip.
- We incorporate two dead block prediction schemes in the L2 harvester to identify those capacity/conflict-caused evictions that are worth keeping on chip. We also devise a simple load balancer that distributes data blocks over unused resources by taking system load and criticality of applications into the account.
- We evaluate our proposed method and compare it to a conventional hierarchy with a larger LLC. Our evaluation results show that a quad-core system with 2MB/core LLC and 1.25 MB/core L2 cache benefiting from L2H improves system performance by up to 2 $\times$ over the baseline. Also, we show that L2H provides competitive system performance compared to a baseline with a 50% larger LLC (12MB).

II. MOTIVATION

According to Microsoft Azure and Alibaba, datacenter core utilization is very low. Servers run at 40% or lower utilization at 90% of the time at Azure [10], and between 20%-50% most of the time at Alibaba [13]. This over-allocation stems from the fact that VMs should have enough cores and resources if the load surges rapidly.

TABLE I
INTEL AND AMD CPU GENERATIONS.

	Intel (2016-2020)			AMD (2017-2022)		
	SKX	CSX	ICX	Rome	Milan(X)	Genoa
L1	32KB	32KB	48KB	32KB	32KB	32KB
L2/core	1MB	1MB	1.25MB	512KB	512KB	1MB
L3/core	1.37MB	1.37MB	1.5MB	4-8MB	4-12MB	4-16MB
Cores	4-28	2-56	8-40	8-64	8-64	8-96
Total	66.5MB	133MB	110MB	288MB	800MB	1100MB
SKU	Xeon-P8180	Xeon-P9282	Xeon-P8380	EPYC-7H12	EPYC-7773X	N/A




Fig. 2. Total cache wasted by different server processors under various utilization. The CDF (red line) is taken from [10].

In addition, CPU manufacturers are increasing the L2/LLC sizes and the number of cores. Table I exhibits three generations of Intel and AMD server CPUs. We can observe that both manufacturers' L2/LLC and core counts have steadily increased over generations. L2 and LLC sizes are reaching 1.25MB/core, 2MB/core for Intel processors, and 1MB/core and 4MB/core for AMD processors. Combined with the fact that core counts are also increasing, we can see that the third generation of Intel processors are accumulating 110MB total cache capacity, while AMD is reaching over giga bytes of on-chip cache storage.

To better understand the current situation in datacenters, Figure 2 shows the total cache capacity wasted by different server processors under various utilization levels. On the x-axis, we show the utilization. We assume that all processors have 32 cores. Thus, the minimum utilization is when there is one application running taking one core and the whole LLC ($\frac{1}{32} = 0.03$), and maximum utilization is when all 32 cores are active ($\frac{32}{32} = 1$). To calculate the total cache wasted (first y-axis), we subtract the used cache capacity under each load from the total cache capacity available on the chip ($32 \times (L1 + L2) + LLC$). For example, if there are two cores running, and $L1=48KB$, $L2=1MB/core$, and $LLC=8MB$, then wasted cache is $32 \times (48KB + 1MB) + 8MB - 2 \times (48KB + 1MB) - 8MB$. On the second y-axis, we show the CDF of core utilization on Azure [10].

As can be seen from Figure 2, 50% of Azure Icelake machines waste around 40% of the total cache capacity. Given that Icelake machines have an L2 capacity of 1.25MB/core (see Table I), for 32 cores, around 35MB of total on-chip cache capacity is wasted that could otherwise be used to keep data blocks on the chip and boost up system performance. AMD processors also suffer from similar issues but at smaller scale. For instance, Rome wastes around 10% of cache capacity




Fig. 3. Impact of LLC size on applications performance.

TABLE II
TOTAL L2 CACHE CAPACITY OF 3 SUPERCOMPUTERS IN THE TACC DATACENTER.

Systems	Nodes	Processor	Core/node	Total L2 (GB)
Frontera [2]	8008	Xeon 8280	56	438
Lonestar6 [4]	560	EPYC 7763	128	35
Chameleon [1]	10000	Haswell	96	469

under the load of 40%. The main reason is that AMD has smaller L2/core, and very large L3/core capacity. However, in Genoa, we observe that AMD is enlarging the L2/core from 512KB/core in Milan to 1MB/core.

To put L2 cache waste into perspective, Table II shows 3 supercomputers in the TACC datacenter (Frontera, Lonestar6, and Chameleon). The table shows the main processor types as well as the number of nodes and total L2 capacity (GB). As can be seen, the total cache capacity in a small-scale datacenter like TACC can be somewhere between 35GB (Lonestar6) to 469GB (Chameleon). Hence, if the utilization is around 50% on average, a substantial amount of a very scarce resource like L2 cache is being wasted (234.5GB in Chameleon and 17.5GB in Lonestar6). Note that public clouds such as AWS, Azure, Google, and Alibaba are operating significantly larger datacenters, so we are projecting the L2 waste reaches to terabytes.

A larger cache capacity can help reduce the long memory access latency. We conduct a cache study on a real machine to measure how much cache capacity impacts system performance. The machine is an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6242 CPU with 22MB 11-way LLC cache. We run one application and change the cache size using Intel Cache Allocation Technology (CAT) from one way (2MB) to 11 ways (22MB). We set the core frequency to 3.9GHz.

Figure 3 shows the performance for three applications: (1) *moses* from TailBench [18], where we sweep the system load in terms of query per second (qps) and cache size; (2) *PageRank* from gapbs [6] with 4 different synthetic inputs (u: uniform graph, and g: Kronecker graph), and two different sizes (20, and 21); and (3) *520.omnetpp* from SPEC CPU 2017 [5].

For *moses* we make two observations: (1) with larger caches, the saturation point (point that P95 increases sharply) is pushed to higher qps (further to the right). For example, we can see that the knee point for 22MB occurs at 450, while for the 2M, the server is saturated at qps=300; 1.5 $\times$ improvement in the maximum load; (2) at similar loads before the saturation point

the larger caches provides better P95 latency. For instance, when qps=250, we see that 2MB LLC provides P95 of 12ms, while the 22MB cache shows P95 of 8ms.

For *PageRank* we observe that a larger LLC reduces the execution time significantly. For example, for the largest graph (g21) the execution time is halved when increasing the LLC size from 2MB to 12MB. We also see that for LLC sizes of greater than 12MB, the execution times remain fixed. Finally, for *520.omnetpp* we observe similar sensitivity to cache size. the execution time constantly reduces from 610 seconds for 2MB LLC, to 420 seconds for 22MB cache. *Our conclusion is that larger cache help applications from different domains, thus wasting a huge amount of on-chip cache is not reasonable, and we need to devise schemes to allow the unused L2 caches to be utilized when possible.*

III. L2 HARVESTER μ ARCHITECTURE

We propose L2H, a simple yet effective mechanism for harvesting L2 caches, that provides performance improvement for memory-bound applications. In this section, we first overview the design of L2H. Then, we discuss the algorithm behind detecting the dead blocks, and how we distribute the blocks over idle cores.

A. L2H: Overview and Organization

Figure 4 shows the overview of L2H. Without loss of generality, we assume there are 4 cores connected to LLC banks with a shared bus. LLC has MPPP dead block predictor [17]. L2H sits between LLC and the memory controller and tracks the writebacks. If a block is detected by the predictor to be not dead, is sent to the load balancer. Then, the load balancer decides where this block can be written to. If there is any idle core that can lend its L2 cache, the load balancer pushes the block up to the lender. Otherwise, if the block is dead, or if there is no free L2, the block is written back to main memory. Thus, in the next reference to this block, there might be a private L2 cache that responds to the request and thereby saves one off-chip transfer.

L2H needs four pieces of information to perform prediction and load balancing: (1) L2 MPKIs; (2) Critical Task Map (CTM): a bit mask that determines if the application being run on a core is critical, “1” determines the application being run at core n is critical. This bit mask is provided by the user or system administrator and is updated as soon as a new application is assigned to cores; (3) Idle Core Map (ICM): a bit mask that determines if a core is idle and can lend its




Fig. 4. L2 harvester architecture. MPPP [17] is the state-of-the-art dead block predictor.

L2 cache. This is updated by the cores if core has nothing to execute; and (4) The output of the MPPP [17] dead block predictor.

B. L2H Structures

Predictor The purpose of the predictor is to determine if a block is dead, and thus it is not worth keeping on chip. This is particularly important for streaming applications because redirecting all cache blocks to upper levels will waste power, increase traffic, and elevate congestion on coherence.

Figure 5 shows the structure of our predictor. We combine two predictors to find dead blocks: (1) a bloom filter-based predictor; and (2) the multi-perspective perceptron predictor (MPPP) [17]. The functionality of the bloom filter-based predictor is simple. We insert the missed addresses into the bloom filter. To make a prediction, we just need to look up the address, if the address was not found in the filter, we conclude the block is dead. Because we have *not* seen a reference to this block recently. We reset the bloom filter periodically to make sure the false positive rate stays low. Unfortunately, after each reset, the bloom filter starts declaring all blocks dead as they have not been seen, thus we need to address this shortcoming.

Morpheus [11] uses a bloom filter for hit/miss prediction, and addresses this problem by using two separate bloom filters with different reset intervals. So, when one of them is being warmed up, the other one services the requests, and vice versa. However, we found that we get better accuracy if we combine our bloom filter with another type of dead block predictor (e.g., perceptron-based dead block predictor). The two predictors complement each other: MPPP covers the bloom filter when it is not warmed up, and the bloom filter makes up for the MPPP sensitivity to thresholds when the system load is high.

We use MPPP to solve the reset problem of the bloom filter. MPPP [17] is a perceptron-based technique that predicts the future reuse of cache blocks. MPPP combines several features including program counter and address to form weight tables. Then taking summations of entries from each table, it predicts if a block is: (a) not dead, (b) dead on arrival, and can bypass the cache, and (c) dead, and can be evicted from the cache.




Fig. 5. L2 harvester predictor.

MPPP uses three thresholds to make the prediction based on the aggregated values taken from the weight tables.

Our experiments show that MPPP works well when MPKI in the system is not very high, but it becomes very sensitive to the thresholds when MPKI is very high. The issue is that when there are many misses, the MPPP tables are updated more frequently; we increase the value for one entry and decrement for the rest (usually cache associativity -1). This lead to a situation where MPPP observes smaller aggregated values. Hence, differentiating dead blocks becomes more challenging. However, this is a situation where the bloom filter works well, because it warms up faster, and can help to detect the addresses that have been evicted recently.

Hence, while the bloom filter is being warmed up, we use MPPP to find the dead blocks, and we rely on the bloom filter when the load is high and MPPP becomes sensitive to the thresholds. The second advantage is that for challenging applications, we can refer to both predictors to decide if a block is dead to increase the accuracy.

As can be seen from Figure 5, when a block arrives, and if the bloom filter is *not* warmed up ($RC < Warmup_TH$), then we have no options other than relying on MPPP for prediction ($Prediction = MPPP_Death$). Otherwise (if the bloom is warmed up $RC > Warmup_TH$), then we have both predictors available to make a prediction. In such a case, if the load is high ($L2\ MPKI > MPKI_TH$) both predictors should agree on the outcome ($Prediction = Seen \ \& \ !MPPP_Death$). Otherwise, the block is *not* dead, if either predictor predicts so ($Prediction = Seen \ | \ !MPPP_Death$).

Load Balancer The purpose of the load balancer is two-fold: (1) find a lender and make decision if a block must be sent up; (2) redirect dead blocks, and non-critical live blocks to the main memory if the system load is high. Figure 7 shows the structure and algorithm of the load balancer.

The load balancer takes as the input five pieces of information: (1) output of the predictor as a boolean signal called *Dead*; (2) average L2 MPKI of caches running user-facing applications; (3) first idle L2 cache obtained from Idle Core Map (ICM) using a round-robin scheme; (4) a boolean




Fig. 6. Probability of sending a non-critical block to a private L2 cache as a function of critical applications MPKI.




Fig. 7. The overview of the load balancer.

signal named *Critical* if this block belongs to the core running critical applications; and (5) total number of critical applications running at the moment in the system obtained from Critical Task Map (CTM).

The intuition behind the load balancer algorithm is to give critical applications with maximum L2 capacity and provide the non-critical applications with as much as the capacity that will not negatively impact the critical applications. The algorithm works as follows: if there is no idle core, or if the block is dead, we must write the block back to main memory. If there is an idle core, and if the block belongs to critical applications, it will be pushed to the first idle resources.

On the other hand, if the block is not critical, we probabilistically send the block to a private L2 cache with a probability that decays as critical L2 MPKI grows. The intuition is that requests should not be sent up when L2 MPKI is high. We arbitrarily choose an exponentially decaying probability density function ($Chance = 0.95^{MPKI}$) as shown in Figure 6. Hence, if the MPKI is low for critical applications, we give a fraction of the capacity to the non-critical applications. As the MPKI for critical applications increases, the chance for non-critical applications decreases. For example, if the MPKI=20, the chance of sending a non-critical application reduces to 30%, while for $MPKIs > 40$, non-critical blocks will be barely sent to the private caches.




Fig. 8. (a) L2H operations; and (b) Circular problem.

C. L2 Harvester Operation

Figure 8 shows how the harvester works in practice. As Figure 8 (a) shows, in Step 1 a cache block is evicted from its private L2 cache, sends over the bus and checks the snoop filter in Step 2 to find its destination port. The snoop filter directs the block to the LLC. This block stays in the LLC until it is evicted in Step 4. The L2 harvester decides to send it to L2-1. The block lookups the snoop filter in Step 5, updates its location to be L2-1, and is filled in the lender in Step 6. Later, when a request to this block arrives, the snoop filter redirects the request to the lender (L2-1), and the response is sent back by the lender to the borrower in Step 8. Note that we do not change the functionality of the snoop filter; this operation is treated as a normal transfer to L2-1.

Possible Circular Harvesting L2H may create a circular situation where a block stays on the chip and never gets evicted despite not being useful. Figure 8 (b) shows such a scenario. Similar to the previous example, assume that in Step 1 a block is redirected to a lender. Thus, it updates the snoop filter (Step 2) and fills in the cache (Step 3). Eventually, this block gets evicted and is sent to the LLC in Step 5. Upon eviction from the LLC, it may again be redirected to a private L2 cache based on a prediction. This loop can happen infinitely, and this cache block will never depart the chip, even though it is not touched. To address this problem, we add one extra bit to the L2 cache tag store indicating if a block has been redirected to the upper-level cache. Then, when we are evicting this cache from the private cache, instead of writing it back to the LLC, we bypass the LLC in Step 6 and write it directly to the main memory. We find this approach to help because this block has been given a second chance already and can be evicted from the cache to avoid creating circular harvesting.

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A. Simulator Configuration

We use the gem5 full-system cycle-level simulator to conduct the experiments [22]. We model a 3-level cache hierarchy where L1 and L2 are inclusive and private and L3 (the LLC) is non-inclusive and shared. L1, L2, and L3 are parallel caches where tag and data stores are accessed in parallel. L1 is 12-way 48KB/core with 1-cycle access latency, L2 is 12-way 1.25MB/core with 12-cycle access latency, and the LLC is 16-way 2MB/core at 25-cycle access latency. We use one

TABLE III
FEATURES USED TO FORM MPPP TABLES [17]: FEATURE(LRU STACK POSITION, START BIT, END BIT, $[n^{th} access]$, [XOR WITH PC]).

bias(6,0)	addr(9,9,14,5,1)	addr(9,12,29,0)	addr(13,21,29,0)
addr(14,17,25,0)	lastmiss(6,0)	lastmiss(18,0)	offset(13,0,4,0)
offset(14,0,6,0)	offset(16,0,1,0)	pc(6,13,31,4,0)	pc(9,11,7,16,0)
pc(13,16,24,17,0)	pc(16,2,10,2,0)	pc(16,4,46,9,0)	pc(17,0,13,5,0)

prefetcher per level: L1 uses AMPM [15], L2 runs DCPT [12], and LLC uses STeMS [34]. L1, L2, and the LLC have 16, 32, 64 MSHR entries.

We also find that always enabling these prefetchers significantly degrades system performance for some applications (e.g., 505.mcf) because the prefetchers contend too strongly with demand requests. We, therefore, implement two prefetch throttling mechanisms. In the first scheme, we reserve 25% of MSHR entries for demand accesses, which decreases the prefetch rate and maintains some minimum demand request service. The second throttling mechanism is that we monitor the performance of the prefetcher periodically and disable a prefetcher when its accuracy drops below 40%. Specifically, in each epoch of 10 million accesses, the prefetchers operate for the first 1 million accesses, then the prefetcher accuracy determines if the prefetcher remains enabled for the following 9 million accesses.

We use the MPPP [17] dead block predictor for the LLC. Similarly to the original design, we use all 16 features suggested by the authors for multicores as listed in Table IV-A. We use 256 randomly selected sets to train the model. When a block is accessed in the cache, all features are extracted from the address, and program counters and used to index the weight tables. Then, we sum up all weights and if it exceeds a threshold, the block is declared dead. To train the model, when any of the sampled sets are accessed (fills or hits in the sampler as suggested in the paper), we extract the features from the access. Then, we use the features to look up the tables and increase the counters. Also, we decrement the counters associated for those blocks that are impacted by sampled access's promotion.

MPPP [17] does not explicitly provide the thresholds in the paper. Hence, in order to find the threshold to declare a block dead, we ran 10 experiments, each running 4 randomly chosen applications and swept the thresholds comparing the MPPP suggestions with those of the bloom filter. We found that if the summation of features is greater than 320, MPPP exhibits the best performance. We refer the reader to MPPP [17] for more detail.

For the bloom filter, we use the structure proposed by Sanchez et al. [29]. The bloom filter has 4096 entries and 4 hash functions. This bloom filter uses a high-quality hash functions (H3 [8]). Given that redirecting evictions is not on a critical path, we do not use parallel bloom filter lookup, and instead use a single-port structure to save power and area.

The main memory is DDR4-3200. There is one command and address bus, with timings based on a DDR4-3200 8Gbit device (Micron MT40A1G8) in an 8×8 configuration. The

total channel capacity is 16GB. This maintains a reasonable core-to-memory ratio for the simulations.

The core has 320, 128, and 128 ROB, LQ, and SQ entries, respectively. The core frequency is set to 3.66GHz. Fetch-, commit-, and writeback-widths are all set to 8. The branch predictor is TAGE_SC_L [32]. The TLB has 128 entries, and there are 8 page-table walkers.

B. Benchmarks

We evaluate the applications of: (1) Tailbench [18] representing user-facing jobs in datacenters; (2) SPEC CPU 2017 [5] representing background jobs; and (3) gapbs graph analytics benchmarks. We mainly choose applications that are memory-bound and benefit from larger cache capacity, but also include some compute-bound applications to show how the proposed solution behaves in such scenarios.

We choose 2 memory-bound applications from Tailbench (*moses* and *img-dnn*) and one compute-bound application (*masstree*). *moses* is a statistical machine translation (SMT) system. The input is randomly-chosen dialogue snippets from the *opensubtitles.org* English-Spanish corpus. *moses* has high L2 and LLC MPKIs of 26, and 22, respectively. *img-dnn* is a handwriting recognition that uses OpenCV under the hood. The input to this application is chosen randomly from MNIST dataset. *img-dnn* shows L2 and LLC MPKIs of 20, and 18, respectively. We also evaluate *masstree* fast key-value store applications written in C++. This application has MPKIs of 6 and 5, respectively. *masstree* is driven with the Yahoo Cloud Serving Benchmark.

We choose 5 memory-bound applications from SPEC CPU 2017: *502.gcc*, *505.mcf*, *519.lbm*, *520.omnetpp*, and *549.fotonik3d*. We also run 3 compute-bound applications: *500.perlbench*, *531.deepsjeng*, and *521.wrf*. From gapbs, we choose 3 applications: the page rank algorithm to find the web page ranking (*pr*), the betweenness centrality score for approximate calculations all vertices in a graph by only computing the shortest paths from a subset of the vertices (*bc*); and single-source shortest paths that computes the distances of the shortest paths from a given source vertex to every other reachable vertex (*sssp*).

We drive *pr*, *bc*, and *sssp* with synthetic graphs: (1) *u*: a synthetically generated graph by the Erddos-Reyni model (Uniform Random); and (2) *g*: a synthetically generated graph by the Kronecker synthetic graph generator. We set the input size to be 2^{20} and 2^{21} . Note that all applications of gapbs are memory-bound, and thus we do not have any compute-bound representative application from this suite.

C. Single-Application Runs

We run *moses*, *masstree*, and *img-dnn* for 250 requests on gem5: We launch Tailbench in integrated mode, where both client and server are running within one process. Then, we warm up the internal data structures by running 1000 requests in fast-simulation mode via KVM CPUs. After the warm-up is finished, we switch the simulator CPU model to the most accurate version (detailed OOO), and continue the simulation

TABLE IV
EVALUATED SYSTEM CONFIGURATION.

Processor	Single and Quad-core, 3.66 GHz, Ubuntu 20.04 OS. ROB:320, LQ:128, SQ:128, Fetch-width=8
L1 Cache	48kB 8-way; 12 ways; LRU; 1 cycles. Prefetcher: AMPM [15]
L2 Cache	1.25MB 12-way; LRU; 16 ways; 12 cycles, Prefetcher: DCPT [12]
L3 Cache	2MB/core; 16-way; LRU; 25 cycles. Prefetcher: STeMS [34]
Main Memory	16 GB; DDR4-3200 x64, 8x8 Micron MT40A1G8

TABLE V
MULTI-PROGRAM APPLICATIONS.

User-facing	img-dnn qps=200, 300, 400	masstree qps=200, 300, 500
Background	bc_u20, pr_u20, sssp_u20, sjeng, omnet, lbm, mcf, perl	

until 250 requests are serviced. Due to the fact that clients and the server are run in one process, architectural statistics are not accurate. Hence, we record request timestamps while the applications are running on top of the simulator, and copy them back to the host, and calculate the P99 of simulated 250 requests.

For SPEC CPU, we use the SimPoint methodology [14] to find representative regions of each application. We use 2 SimPoints of 250 million instructions each and 250 million instructions for warmup. For gapbs, we run each application 10 times after the graph was generated.

D. Multi-Applications Runs

We use Tailbench to represent the user-facing latency-critical applications, and SPEC CPU 17 and gapbs applications as background tasks. Due to gem5 limitations, simulating more than 4 cores is very slow and difficult. Hence, we limit our study to 4 cores. For user-facing applications we choose one application from img-dnn, masstree, and moses, and one application from SPEC CPU 2017, or gapbs. We leave two cores idle each can provide 1.25MB L2 cache. Similar to the single-application scenario, we run the user-facing applications for 250 requests and make sure the background job continues to run until the simulation is finished. We create 50 random mixes out of the applications listed in Table V.

E. Systems

We compare three 4-core systems: (1) baseline with an 8MB LLC; (2) the baseline configuration but with a 12MB LLC; and (3) L2H with an 8MB LLC. Depending on the number of applications running, L2H can borrow 3, 2, or 1 L2 caches. Hence, the total L2 and L3 capacity for L2H is 8MB LLC + $3 \times 1.25\text{MB} = 11.75\text{MB}$ at most when it borrows three L2 caches, and 8MB LLC + $1 \times 1.25\text{MB} = 9.25\text{MB}$, when it borrows one L2 cache.

V. EVALUATION RESULTS

A. Single Application with Three Lenders

Performance In this section, we analyze a scenario where one application is running, and there are three idle cores (25% utilization) lending their private L2 caches. Figure 9 shows the impact of LLC configuration on the latency-throughput curves in terms of P99 latency. We compare three LLC configurations (8MB, 12MB, or 8MB+L2H with 3.75MB of borrowed L2 capacity) on three user-facing applications (*img-dnn*, *moses*, and *masstree*).

img-dnn benefits from the larger cache the most. L2H closely follows the 12MB LLC, while the gap between these two and the 8MB LLC stays fairly constant (2X better P99). The reason for such a large performance improvement can stems from the large reduction in MPKI. As shown in Figure 11, the *img-dnn* MPKI decreases from 26 to 2 when the LLC size reaches 12MB. This implies that *img-dnn* working set size fits in the larger LLC, and thus a huge P99 improvement is realized. *L2H could provide the needed capacity for such applications almost for free with a 33% smaller LLC size (8MB vs. 12MB).*

moses performance is shown in Figure 9 (middle). At the lowest qps (100), *moses* shows 7% and 5% lower P99 for a 12MB LLC and L2H compared to the baseline with 8MB LLC, respectively. L2H closely tracks the 12MB LLC.

Figure 9 (right) shows the performance of *masstree*, whose MPKI is very low (1.1). This application is not memory bound, so we do not expect to see improvement in P99 when the LLC grows. We also expect L2H to not negatively impact the P99 latency. As expected, all three systems show very similar P99 latency, meaning L2H does not interfere with compute-bound applications. We observe similar behavior (not shown) across other compute-bound applications as well (*shore*, *xapian*, *specJBB*, and *silo*).

In addition to lowering the P99 latency, extra cache space can increase the maximum supported load: the qps after which the P99 latency increases sharply. For *img-dnn* the saturation point is pushed to higher qps by the 12 MB LCC and L2H: baseline with 8MB LLC has a rapid increase in P99 for $\text{qps} > 200$, but the saturation point occurs at $\text{qps} = 500$ for both L2H and the 12MB LLC.

Figure 10 shows system performance on the gapbs and SPEC CPU 2017 benchmark suites. The harmonic mean speedups for L2H are 15% and 1.7% for gapbs, and SPEC CPU 2017, respectively. Among gapbs application, page rank with the *u:21* input exhibits the largest speedup ($2.77\times$ for the 12MB LLC and $1.26\times$ for L2H). As with *img-dnn* case, the MPKI of *pr_u21* decreases from 36 to 15.

SPEC CPU applications also benefit from larger caches, but to a lesser extent. We found that only 3 applications somewhat benefit from larger caches in this benchmark suite: *omnet* 6.2%, *505.mcf* 4.5%, and *lbm* 3.9%. However, the majority of applications do not significantly benefit from the larger caches. We found two reasons for this behavior: (1) some applications are cache-friendly, but an 8MB LLC is sufficient for them; and




Fig. 9. Impact of LLC size, and QPS on applications performance for (1) baseline with 8MB LLC; (2) baseline with 12MB LLC; and (3) L2H with 8MB LLC, and 3 lenders each 1.25MB.




Fig. 10. Impact of LLC size on applications performance for (1) baseline with 8MB LLC; (2) baseline with 12MB LLC; and (3) L2H with 8MB LLC, and 3 lenders each 1.25MB.

(2) other applications such as *perl* and *wrf* are not memory-bound, and their MPKIs are less than 2.

MPKI Figure 11 shows the MPKI for the three LLC configurations. The normalized geo-mean performance of the 12MB LLC and L2H are 15% and 12% better than the baseline with an 8MB LLC, respectively. Note that L2H achieves this 12% better MPKI with 33% less LLC size (8MB vs. 12MB). This brings a substantial saving in terms of area, power and cost. We make two observations: (1) there are applications such as *pr* and *img-dnn* whose MPKIs are reduced significantly due to fitting the whole working set in the cache; and (2) there are applications with various MPKI ranging from 1 to 55 in our evaluation, stressing the load balancer properly.

Prediction Accuracy Figure 12 shows the prediction accuracy of L2H. We calculate the accuracy by counting how many blocks are sent up and what fraction of those are requested by the borrower. The average prediction accuracy for memory-bound applications is 89%. The averages are 96%, 75%, and 70% for gapbs (applications with the highest MPKIs), Tailbench, and SPEC CPU 2017, respectively. There are some applications with low prediction accuracy such as *perl*, *gcc*, and *wrf*, but given that their MPKIs are very low (< 2), the mispredictions have insignificant impact.

Traffic Analysis L2H sends data blocks to upper-level caches based on a heuristic. Although the prediction accuracy is high, we need to carefully study any increased traffic on the shared interconnect. Figure 13 shows the traffic for the 12MB cache and L2H normalized to the baseline traffic of the 8MB LLC: the First bar is the 12MB LLC and the second bar is L2H. We also separate the actual packets from the snoop packets, as they usually have different sizes and purposes: the dark blue represents actual packets and the light blue represents the snoop packet seen on the interconnect connecting L2 caches to LLC.

As can be seen from Figure 13, the 12MB LLC has

consistently lower or equal traffic. This is expected because the larger cache keeps more data blocks on the chip than the 8MB LLC, so it does not generate more traffic. In terms of packet count, we can see that the majority of packets are data packets and not snoop, as there is only one application running. Given that we are running in full-system mode, the OS processes are running on the cores and may share data blocks, but this is negligible. Hence, overall, the 12MB LLC has less traffic.

On the other hand, the geo-mean for L2H is 24% increase in traffic. This increase in traffic is expected as the blocks are sent up and distributed over private L2 caches. However, the behavior of L2H is very dynamic: some applications, such as *mcf* generate more traffic (42% more), while others, like *img-dnn* generate less traffic (-20%). Compute-bound applications (those applications for which L2H has no impact) exhibit no change in traffic. To understand this behavior better, we show the breakdown of packets for two applications in Figure 14 and Figure 15.

The increase in traffic comes from two sources: (1) sending blocks up to a private cache, indicated as *WriteUp* requests in Figure 14 and Figure 15; (2) evicting a block that has been sent to a private cache (without first reusing it). The load balancer and the predictor accuracy determine how many *WriteUpRequest* are generated. Given that prediction accuracy is high in L2H, we believe that extra traffic generated by *WriteUps* will actually help performance.

L2H increases snoop traffic because it first checks the snoop filter before sending up a block. This ensures that data is not needlessly replicated. Depending on the data block status (clean or writeback clean), this snoop request is either *CleanEvict* or *WritebackClean*. This snoop check is the main reason why we see an increase in *WritebackClean* and *CleanEvict* in Figure 14 and Figure 15.

We observe that for *mcf* (prediction accuracy=96%, traffic increase=42%), *WritebackClean*, and *CleanEvict* are substan-




Fig. 11. MPKI for 3 systems: (1) an 8MB LLC; (2) a 12 MB LLC; and (3) L2H.




Fig. 12. Prediction accuracy. Fraction of blocks that the load balancer sends to private L2 caches that satisfy a request.




Fig. 13. Traffic increase on the bus between L2s and LLC normalized to a baseline with 8MB LLC. The first bar is a baseline with 12MB, and the second bar is L2H. The dark color is the data packets, and the light blue is the snoop packets.




Fig. 14. Example of high prediction accuracy (96%), and high traffic (42%). Breakdown of packets seen on the bus between L2s and LLC for 505.mcf. L2H is the only one that has WriteUp packets.




Fig. 15. Example of mediocre prediction accuracy (75%), and low bus traffic (-20%). Breakdown of packets seen on the bus between L2s and LLC for img-dnn. L2H is the only one that has WriteUp packets.

tially higher than the baselines, leading to a situation where the total traffic increases by 42%. On the other hand, for *img-dnn* because the larger cache can fit the working set size, the *CleanEvict* for L2H stays very close to that of the 12MB LLC, helping to reduce the total traffic by 20%.

B. Two Applications with Two Lenders

Performance We now focus on a more complex scenario, where there are two applications running: core 0 runs a user-facing application and core 1 runs a background job. Thus, there are two idle cores (50% utilization). Figure 16 shows the reduction in P99 for the user-facing application (top) and speedup for the background job (bottom). We normalize both to the baseline with an 8MB LLC. We sort the workloads in ascending order to yield S-curves. For the P99, the lower is the better, while for the speedup the higher is the better. We observe that P99 decreases to almost 60%, while the background job is sped up by up to 50%. We also show the 12MB LLC configuration. As can be seen, L2H closely follows the behavior of the larger 12MB LLC.

To better understand the results, we take a deeper look at two mixes shown in Figure 17. The first mix has *img-dnn* as the user-facing job and *omnet* as the background job. From the single-application experiments (Figure 11), we expect these two applications to be very sensitive to cache size. In this experiment, we vary the request rate from 200 to 400 qps. We make two observations: (1) as expected the absolute P99 latency increases compared to a single-application run (from 50ms to 126ms). However, the server is not saturated and (2) L2H helps P99 stay very close to that with the 12MB LLC. For example, at qps=400, the P99 latency for the baseline with an 8MB LLC is around 200ms while the L2H keeps it very close to that of the 12MB LLC at 150ms. This is significantly given that our result shows that *omnet* IPC also improves by 4% at the same time. It is evident that the load balancer has helped both applications to share the extra space provided by the idle cores.

Prediction Accuracy Figure 18 shows the prediction accuracy




Fig. 16. System performance s-curve, normalized to the baseline with an 8MB LLC. (Top) Normalized P99 latency of user-facing jobs; the lower, the better; (b) Background job speedup.




Fig. 17. P99 latency of two pairs of applications.

for all 50 mixes. The average prediction accuracy is 86% and ranges from 62% to 99%. Overall, the high prediction accuracy carries from the single-application experiments. We also measure how often the bloom filter is not warmed up and we need to refer or MPPI (15%), the load is high and we must get the same output from both predictors (40%), and finally how often we need one predictor to send a block up (45%). We observe that all three situations are serviced well, given the high prediction accuracy.




Fig. 18. Multi-application prediction accuracy.




Fig. 19. Load balancer analysis. When MPKI is low, L2H approaches the baseline with 12MB LLC as the foreground job yields extra space. When MPKI is high, the background job approaches the baseline with 8MB LLC as the load balancer gives extra space to the background job.

C. Load Balancer Analysis

One major benefit of L2H is software transparency. The load balancer plays an important role to achieve this goal. To better understand how the load balancer works in practice, we designed a simple experiment where we varied the critical application MPKI to reveal how the load balancer works.

Figure 19 shows the absolute IPC for two applications and 3 systems (baseline with an 8MB LLC, a 12MB LLC, and L2H) over time: foreground job *bc*, and background job *mcf*. We pick *bc* to be the foreground job because the input to this workload can be changed such that the MPKI changes. We call this workload foreground, and not user-facing because this is not a usual user-facing application. We could not find any Tailnech applications whose MPKI changes easily. We use *bc* with input *g19* to have the foreground job show MPKI=5, input *u20* to reach the MPKI to 15, and input *u21* to increase the MPKI to 41. We annotate the figure to show these three MPKI regions over time.

Based on the load balancer algorithm and Figure 6, we expect that in this first region (MPKI=5), the background job gets the majority of the extra space as the critical application has very low MPKI and is driven with a small graph ($0.95^5 = 0.77$ of alive *mcf* blocks are sent up). We observe that in this region,

all three system show very close IPC for *bc*, and all provide enough cache for this application. Interestingly, for MPKI=5 and *mc*, we notice that L2H is very close to the baseline with 12MB LLC, and 13% better than the baseline with 8MB LLC. Hence, the load balancer has redirected data blocks properly and fairly to private L2 caches in this region.

In the second region (MPKI=15), we expect that all *bc* alive blocks and $0.95^{15} = 0.46$ of *mc* alive blocks get the chance to stay on the chip because now the foreground MPKI has increases. We make two observations in this region: (1) *bc* gets more space allowing it to follow the baseline with 21MB cache. Also, this extra space allows L2H and the 12 MB LLC to execute faster; the peaks are shifting to the right for the 8MB LLC; and (2) now the *mc* sits between the 8MB and 12MB LLCs because it now must yield the extra space.

Finally, in the third region (MPKI=41), baseline the 12MB LLC and L2H continue to execute faster than baseline LLC=8MB for *bc*. The difference between the peaks is now more visible; The peak at t_0 for the 12MB LLC arrives earlier than L2H (t_1), and the baseline 8MB (t_2). In this region, the background job approaches the baseline with 8MB LLC, mainly because the load balancer does not allow it to send the blocks up ($0.95^{41} = 0.12$).

D. Storage Overhead Analysis

L2H uses two predictors. The bloom filter can store 4096 entries. It has 4 tables, each 4K, summing up to a total of 16KB storage overhead per processor. MPPP uses 256 sampled sets, adding up to 68.63KB. Other components in L2H are fairly small. Idle Core Map (ICM) and Critical Task Map each requires n bits, where n is the number of cores (e.g., 128 bits = 16B). We store the sendup likelihood in a lookup table to avoid computation. This needs $100 \times 2B = 200B$ storage. Overall, L2H needs 84.85KB storage for a 128-core processor.

VI. RELATED WORK

The insight behind Morpheus [11] is similar to that of L2H, but for GPUs. The authors observe that increasing the number of SMs is not always useful and system performance stays constant after a certain number of SMs. They propose to not activate several SMs, and instead borrow some resources such as cache or register files from idle SMs. Apart from applying this idea to a different context (GPU vs. CPU in L2H), the differences are two-fold. First, idleness in L2H comes from natural underutilization in the cloud, while Morpheus needs to deactivate SMs to be able to borrow resources. This requires Morpheus to run profiling to find the optimal number of SMs for each application. Second, GPUs lack coherent caches, substantially increasing complexity and requiring extensive changes to the GPU microarchitecture. In contrast, L2H relies on existing mechanisms and adds off-the-critical path predictors at the LLC. Overall, both techniques address important underutilization scenarios, but very different ones.

Jenga [36], and Eva [7] address underutilization in caches by redesigning a new reconfigurable virtual cache hierarchy. Jenga defines a pool of caches where a run-time decides

how each of them should be used. They propose an adaptive hierarchy allocation which finds the exact number of cache banks as well as the right cache level. They also propose a placement strategy called Bandwidth-aware data placement, where they try to put data blocks in the hierarchy where it makes more sense in terms of bandwidth. Jenga breaks the rigid hierarchy in the interest of reconfigurability, where L2H keeps the classic memory hierarchy but opens the path to use all levels automatically. Jenga requires OS and run-time support, while L2H is completely transparent to software.

D2D [31] split data hierarchy from metadata hierarchy allowing the data blocks to be found in the memory hierarchy with a single lookup. Separating metadata from data allows the authors to propose optimizations for data placement. However, D2D cannot utilize the unused cache, instead helps to find the block faster.

IBM Z16 [3], the latest generation of IBM mainframe processors, has 4 levels of caches L1=128KB, L2=32 MB, L3=up to 256 MB, and L4=2048 MB. L3 and L4 are called virtual caches similar to Jenga's definition. They can be allocated on any of the share part of any L2 cache. Hence, with proper run-time management, the L2 waste can be reduced. For IBM z16 to work, the IBM Processor Resource/Systems Manager (PR/SM) scheduler and the z/OS WLM and dispatcher must work together to enable and use the large caches. IBM also optimizes the lithography to reduce the cache access latency. Z16 also needs a translation layer to be able to find the data block in banked caches scattered throughout the chip. We believe that the classic hierarchy offers a simpler design, and can be fixed to make better use of the caches with L2H.

CATCH [23] proposes a criticality-aware tiered cache hierarchy, where the authors argue that having a large L2 cache is not an efficient design choice as L2 is not large enough to capture the working set completely, nor as fast as the L1 cache. Instead, CATCH proposes to remove the L2 cache and compensate for its loss with new inter-level prefetchers to move data in a timely manner between a larger LLC and the L1 caches. We argue that the L2 is still very valuable. First, it is very effective for some applications [16]. Second, L2 is very effective in reducing the number of coherence requests as it is usually inclusive of L1 cache. Thus, keeping L2 is a good design choice, and its low hit ratio can be compensated for by borrowing/lending space from/to neighboring cores.

Dead block prediction is another way to increase LLC utilization. A cache block is dead if it has exhausted its useful lifetime in the cache, and can be evicted to make space for other blocks [17], [20], [35]. Using perceptron-based prediction proposed in some prior work [17], [35]. Using sampling to detect dead blocks suggested by authors of [20].

Cache partitioning is a strategy to provide quality of service for over-provisioning datacenters cores [21], [24]–[26], [28], [30], [33], [37]–[41]. They use Intel Cache Allocation Technology to partition LLC on a real machine or a cluster of machines. L2H is orthogonal to cache partitioning, although try to provide fairness for datacenter applications.

VII. CONCLUSION

We propose L2 Harvester (L2H), a simple approach to harvest unused L2 caches in low-utilization beefy server processors. We make this observation that number of cores and cache sizes (both L2 and LLC) are constantly increasing while the core utilization struggles to catch up in public clouds (mostly <40% in Azure, and around 20-50% in Alibaba). To address this shortcoming, we devise a mechanism to detect LLC evictions that are not dead, and redirect them to upper L2 caches, if the system load permits. L2H is implemented with minimal changes to the current architecture. Our experimental results show that L2H improves system performance by up to 2×, and 32% for single-application and multiple-application, respectively.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge Chameleon@TACC for providing computation resources. This work was supported by National Science Foundation under Grant #1719061

REFERENCES

- [1] “Chameleon@tacc.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.tacc.utexas.edu/systems/chameleon;jsessionid=5D400D22FD7EBF40C5D8AE9ECB366EB2>
- [2] “Frontera@tacc.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.tacc.utexas.edu/systems/frontera;jsessionid=5D400D22FD7EBF40C5D8AE9ECB366EB2>
- [3] “Ibm z16 (3931) technical guide.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.redbooks.ibm.com/abstracts/sg248951.html>
- [4] “Lonestart6@tacc.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.tacc.utexas.edu/systems/lonestar6;jsessionid=5D400D22FD7EBF40C5D8AE9ECB366EB2>
- [5] “Spec cpu2017,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.spec.org/cpu2017>
- [6] S. Beamer, K. Asanović, and D. Patterson, “The gap benchmark suite,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.03619*, 2015.
- [7] N. Beckmann and D. Sanchez, “Maximizing Cache Performance Under Uncertainty,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd international symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA-23)*, February 2017.
- [8] J. L. Carter and M. N. Wegman, “Universal classes of hash functions (extended abstract),” in *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’77. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1977, p. 106–112. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/800105.803400>
- [9] J. Chang and G. Sohi, “Cooperative caching for chip multiprocessors,” in *33rd International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA’06)*, 2006, pp. 264–276.
- [10] E. Cortez, A. Bonde, A. Muzio, M. Russinovich, M. Fontoura, and R. Bianchini, “Resource central: Understanding and predicting workloads for improved resource management in large cloud platforms,” in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, October 2017.
- [11] S. Darabi, M. Sadrosadati, N. Akbarzadeh, J. Lindegger, M. Hosseini, J. Park, J. Gómez-Luna, O. Mutlu, and H. Sarbazi-Azad, “Morpheus: Extending the last level cache capacity in gpu systems using idle gpu core resources,” in *2022 55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, 2022, pp. 228–244.
- [12] M. Grannaes, M. Jahre, and L. Natvig, “Multi-level hardware prefetching using low complexity delta correlating prediction tables with partial matching,” in *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on High Performance Embedded Architectures and Compilers*, ser. HiPEAC’10. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2010, pp. 247–261.
- [13] J. Guo, Z. Chang, S. Wang, H. Ding, Y. Feng, L. Mao, and Y. Bao, “Who limits the resource efficiency of my datacenter: An analysis of alibaba datacenter traces,” in *2019 IEEE/ACM 27th International Symposium on Quality of Service (IWQoS)*, 2019, pp. 1–10.
- [14] G. Hamerly, E. Perelman, J. Lau, and B. Calder, “Simpont 3.0: Faster and more flexible program phase analysis,” *J. Instruction-Level Parallelism*, vol. 7, 2005. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jilp.org/vol7/v7paper14.pdf>
- [15] Y. Ishii, M. Inaba, and K. Hiraki, “Access map pattern matching for data cache prefetch,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Supercomputing*, ser. ICS ’09. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2009, pp. 499–500. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1542275.1542349>
- [16] M. Jalili and M. Erez, “Reducing load latency with cache level prediction,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2022, pp. 648–661.
- [17] D. A. Jiménez and E. Teran, “Multiperspective reuse prediction,” in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, ser. MICRO-50 ’17. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, p. 436–448. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3123939.3123942>
- [18] H. Kasture and D. Sanchez, “Tailbench: a benchmark suite and evaluation methodology for latency-critical applications,” in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*, 2016, pp. 1–10.
- [19] S. M. Khan, D. A. Jiménez, D. Burger, and B. Falsafi, “Using dead blocks as a virtual victim cache,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques*, ser. PACT ’10. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2010, p. 489–500. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1854273.1854333>
- [20] S. M. Khan, Y. Tian, and D. A. Jiménez, “Sampling dead block prediction for last-level caches,” in *2010 43rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, 2010, pp. 175–186.
- [21] D. Lo, L. Cheng, R. Govindaraju, P. Ranganathan, and C. Kozyrakis, “Heracles: Improving resource efficiency at scale,” in *2015 ACM/IEEE 42nd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 2015, pp. 450–462.
- [22] J. Lowe-Power, A. M. Ahmad, A. Akram, M. Alian, R. Amslinger, M. Andreozzi, A. Arnejach, N. Asmussen, B. Beckmann, S. Bharadwaj, G. Black, G. Bloom, B. R. Bruce, D. R. Carvalho, J. Castrillon, L. Chen, N. Derumigny, S. Diestelhorst, W. Elsasser, C. Escuin, M. Fariborz, A. Farmahini-Farahani, P. Fotouhi, R. Gambord, J. Gandhi, D. Gope, T. Grass, A. Gutierrez, B. Hanindhito, A. Hansson, S. Haria, A. Harris, T. Hayes, A. Herrera, M. Horsnell, S. A. R. Jafri, R. Jagtap, H. Jang, R. Jeyapaul, T. M. Jones, M. Jung, S. Kannoth, H. Khaleghzadeh, Y. Kodama, T. Krishna, T. Marinelli, C. Menard, A. Mondelli, M. Moreto, T. Mück, O. Naji, K. Nathella, H. Nguyen, N. Nikoleris, L. E. Olson, M. Orr, B. Pham, P. Prieto, T. Reddy, A. Roelke, M. Samani, A. Sandberg, J. Setoain, B. Shingarov, M. D. Sinclair, T. Ta, R. Thakur, G. Travaglini, M. Upton, N. Vaish, I. Vougioukas, W. Wang, Z. Wang, N. Wehn, C. Weis, D. A. Wood, H. Yoon, and E. F. Zulian, “The gem5 simulator: Version 20.0+,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.03152>
- [23] A. V. Nori, J. Gaur, S. Rai, S. Subramoney, and H. Wang, “Criticality aware tiered cache hierarchy: A fundamental relook at multi-level cache hierarchies,” in *Proceedings of the 45th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ser. ISCA ’18. IEEE Press, 2018, p. 96–109. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2018.00019>
- [24] J. Park, S. Park, and W. Baek, “Copart: Coordinated partitioning of last-level cache and memory bandwidth for fairness-aware workload consolidation on commodity servers,” in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth EuroSys Conference 2019*, ser. EuroSys ’19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3302424.3303963>
- [25] T. Patel and D. Tiwari, “Clite: Efficient and qos-aware co-location of multiple latency-critical jobs for warehouse scale computers,” in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2020, pp. 193–206.
- [26] L. Pons, V. Selfa, J. Sahuquillo, S. Petit, and J. Pons, “Improving system turnaround time with intel cat by identifying llc critical applications,” in *Euro-Par 2018: Parallel Processing: 24th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Computing, Turin, Italy, August 27 - 31, 2018, Proceedings*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2018, p. 603–615. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96983-1_43
- [27] M. K. Qureshi, “Adaptive spill-receive for robust high-performance caching in cmps,” in *2009 IEEE 15th International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture*, 2009, pp. 45–54.

- [28] R. B. Roy, T. Patel, and D. Tiwari, "Satori: Efficient and fair resource partitioning by sacrificing short-term benefits for long-term gains," in *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 2021, pp. 292–305.
- [29] D. Sanchez, L. Yen, M. D. Hill, and K. Sankaralingam, "Implementing signatures for transactional memory," in *40th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO 2007)*, 2007, pp. 123–133.
- [30] V. Selfa, J. Sahuquillo, L. Eeckhout, S. Petit, and M. E. Gómez, "Application clustering policies to address system fairness with intel's cache allocation technology," in *2017 26th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*, 2017, pp. 194–205.
- [31] A. Sembrant, E. Hagersten, and D. Black-Schaffer, "Navigating the cache hierarchy with a single lookup," in *2014 ACM/IEEE 41st International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 2014, pp. 133–144.
- [32] A. Seznec, "Tage-sc-l branch predictors again," in *5th JILP Workshop on Computer Architecture Competitions (JWAC-5): Championship Branch Prediction (CBP-5)*, 2016.
- [33] M. Shahrad, S. Elnikety, and R. Bianchini, "Provisioning differentiated last-level cache allocations to vms in public clouds," in *Proceedings of the Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC)*. ACM, November 2021.
- [34] S. Somogyi, T. F. Wenisch, A. Ailamaki, and B. Falsafi, "Spatio-temporal memory streaming," in *Proceedings of the 36th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ser. ISCA '09. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2009, pp. 69–80. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1555754.1555766>
- [35] E. Teran, Z. Wang, and D. A. Jiménez, "Perceptron learning for reuse prediction," in *2016 49th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, 2016, pp. 1–12.
- [36] P.-A. Tsai, N. Beckmann, and D. Sanchez, "Jenga: Software-Defined Cache Hierarchies," in *Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium in Computer Architecture (ISCA-44)*, June 2017.
- [37] X. Wang, S. Chen, J. Setter, and J. F. Martínez, "Swap: Effective fine-grain management of shared last-level caches with minimum hardware support," in *2017 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2017, pp. 121–132.
- [38] Y. Xiang, X. Wang, Z. Huang, Z. Wang, Y. Luo, and Z. Wang, "Dcaps: Dynamic cache allocation with partial sharing," in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth EuroSys Conference*, ser. EuroSys '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3190508.3190511>
- [39] X. Zhang, S. Dwarkadas, and K. Shen, "Towards practical page coloring-based multicore cache management," in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems*, ser. EuroSys '09. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2009, p. 89–102. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1519065.1519076>
- [40] L. Zhao, Y. Yang, K. Zhang, X. Zhou, T. Qiu, K. Li, and Y. Bao, "Rhythm: Component-distinguishable workload deployment in datacenters," in *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, ser. EuroSys '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342195.3387534>
- [41] H. Zhu and M. Erez, "Dirigent: Enforcing qos for latency-critical tasks on shared multicore systems," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ser. ASPLOS '16. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, p. 33–47. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872362.2872394>