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ABSTRACT

Energy harvesting system has huge potential to enable battery-less Internet of Things (IoT) services. However, it has been designed without a cache due to the difficulty of crash consistency guarantee, limiting its performance. This paper introduces Write-Light Cache (WL-Cache), a specialized cache architecture with a new write policy for energy harvesting systems. WL-Cache combines benefits of a write-back cache and a write-through cache while avoiding their downsides. Unlike a write-through cache, WL-Cache does not access a non-volatile main memory (NVM) at every store but it holds dirty cache lines in a cache to exploit locality, saving energy and improving performance. Unlike a write-back cache, WL-Cache limits the number of dirty lines in a cache. When power is about to be cut off, WL-Cache flushes the bounded set of dirty lines to NVM in a failure-atomic manner by leveraging a just-in-time (JIT) checkpointing mechanism to achieve crash consistency across power failure. For optimization, WL-Cache interacts with a run-time system that estimates the quality of energy source during each power-on period, and adaptively reconfigures the possible number of dirty cache lines at boot time. Our experiments demonstrate that WL-Cache reduces hardware complexity and provides a significant speedup over the state-of-the-art volatile cache design with non-volatile backup. For two representative power outage traces, WL-Cache achieves 1.35x and 1.44x average speedups, respectively, across 23 benchmarks used in prior work.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Energy harvesting systems offer battery-less computing that is deemed to be the next step in the evolution of IoT [56]. Without a battery, energy harvesting systems can self-power their devices by collecting ambient energy from external sources (e.g., radio frequency, WiFi, etc.). They enable various applications such as wearables, sensors, and implantable medical devices in which a battery-equipped design could be bulky, environment-unfriendly, and cost-inefficient—apart from regular battery replacements [3, 15, 30, 54, 55, 63].

However, due to unreliable nature of ambient energy sources, energy harvesting systems suffer from frequent power failures. To mitigate the problem, existing energy harvesting systems leverage a small capacitor as an energy buffer and employ a non-volatile processor (NVP) that can instantly checkpoint/restore all on-chip data, i.e., volatile registers to/from neighboring non-volatile flip-flops at a power failure/recovery point [69]. In addition, the systems use non-volatile memory (NVM), not Flash, as main memory to persist all off-chip data across power failure.1 Notably, they do not make use of (volatile) cache since its states are lost across power failure causing a crash consistency problem [14, 35]. That is, without a cache, they directly persist data on NVM at the cost of long NVM access latency for every memory operation, resulting in poor performance.

A cache has high potential to significantly improve performance for energy harvesting systems. Given an energy budget, they can make a further forward execution progress by avoiding NVM accesses on cache hits. Unfortunately, leveraging a cache in energy harvesting systems remains a challenge due to the difficulty of crash consistency guarantee. Different cache write policies (i.e., write-through or write-back) have different implications on the crash consistency. A (volatile) write-through cache directly achieves crash consistency as it has no concern about losing volatile cache states across power failures. However, it requires updating both the cache and NVM on each memory store and thus consumes more power, offsetting the caching benefits.

In contrast, a write-back cache does not update NVM until dirty cachelines are evicted to NVM, i.e., write hits do not involve NVM access. However, to ensure crash consistency, it requires additional hardware support that can flush all the updated (dirty) cachelines to NVM before impending power failure. For example, prior works introduce a write-back NVSRAM cache [16, 41, 69] that uses a volatile SRAM cache backed with the same size non-volatile (NV) cache counterpart. When power is about to be cut off, the NVSRAM cache triggers just-in-time (JIT) checkpointing that can fails-atomically flush the entire cache [41, 69] or dirty lines [16] to the neighboring NV counterpart. This approach has two downsides: (1) its hardware modification cost is high—no such fabrication has been adopted for production yet; and (2) it requires reserving a large amount of extra energy enough to backup all cache lines (in the worst case all

1Flash memory requires (9x) higher voltage and incurs orders-of-magnitude slower write latency (1000x) than byte-addressable NVM such as FRAM [1].
This paper presents Write-Light² Cache (WL-Cache), specialized cache architecture with a new write policy for energy harvesting systems. In particular, WL-Cache builds upon traditional SRAM cache design without requiring non-volatile cache counterpart and combines the benefits of a write-through cache and a write-back cache while avoiding their downsides. Unlike a write-through cache, WL-Cache does not update data in NVM main memory at every store, but it holds dirty lines in a cache to take advantage of locality, saving energy and improving performance. Unlike a write-back cache, WL-Cache permits only a limited number of dirty lines in a cache. That way WL-Cache has only to secure a small amount of energy—so that the bounded number of dirty lines can be JIT-checkpointed—without expensive backup/restoration costs.

To achieve this, WL-Cache tracks a set of dirty cache lines in a separate small hardware queue, called DirtyQueue. Then, WL-Cache uses two reconfigurable thresholds, named maxline and waterline. On the other hand, the maxline threshold (≤ |DirtyQueue|) determines the maximum number of dirty cache lines in WL-Cache. When the number of dirty cache lines reaches maxline, WL-Cache stalls a store instruction until a free slot in DirtyQueue becomes available. Importantly, maxline determines and bounds the amount of energy WL-Cache needs to reserve to failure-atomically checkpoint dirty cache lines—which is much lower than that of the NVSRAM cache—when power failure is impending.

The waterline threshold (≤ maxline) determines when WL-Cache writes back dirty cache lines to NVM. When the number of dirty lines exceed waterline, WL-Cache picks one of dirty lines and asynchronously writes it back to NVM. The persisted cache line remains in the cache with a “clean” state for future references. The asynchronous write-back operation overlaps with the execution of following instructions, realizing instruction-level parallelism (ILP). The gap between maxline and waterline defines the potential ILP opportunity, not available in a write-through cache.

For optimization, WL-Cache interacts with a run-time system that adaptively adjusts the two thresholds depending on the energy harvesting quality. The run-time system measures a power-on period (without cache) and provides hardware support for JIT checkpointing of volatile architectural states from the NVFFs and resumes the interrupted program. They monitor the capacitor by using a voltage monitoring system, and checkpoint all volatile architectural states to NVM just before a power outage occurs. When the power returns, they restore the states and resume the interrupted program.

This paper presents WL-Cache, a new cache design for energy harvesting systems.

WL-Cache introduces a new cache write policy that takes advantages of both write-back’s efficiency and write-through’s persistence.

WL-Cache adaptively behaves as a write-through or a write-back cache by changing its characteristic back and forth with the quality of energy source in mind.

Our experiments demonstrate that WL-Cache significantly outperforms existing cache designs, including the state-of-the-art NVSRAM cache, regardless of capacitor size.

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

2.1 Energy Harvesting System Architecture

Energy harvesting systems collect ambient energy into a small capacitor and spend the energy for computing without a battery. Due to the battery-less design, they suffer frequent power failures and thus should ensure crash consistency to resume a power-interrupted program [9–13, 36, 61, 70]. Unfortunately, prior undo/redo logging-based crash consistency solutions [8, 21–23, 26, 34, 35, 37–40, 68, 76, 77] do not fit well for energy harvesting systems because logging requires additional memory writes, consuming hard-won energy.

To address the challenge, recent works [19, 50, 51, 69] have adopted checkpoint-and-restore-based crash consistency, called just-in-time (JIT) checkpointing. They monitor the capacitor by using a voltage monitoring system, and checkpoint all volatile architectural states to NVM just before a power outage occurs. When the power returns, they restore the states and resume the interrupted program.

At a high level, a representative energy harvesting system, Non-Volatile Processor (NVP) [42–49, 66, 67], uses NVM as main memory (without cache) and provides hardware support for JIT checkpointing of volatile registers to ensure whole system persistence guarantee [28, 53]. When its operating voltage drops below a certain threshold (𝑉𝑏𝑢𝑐𝑘𝑎𝑝), NVP instantly checkpoints all the registers into their neighboring non-volatile flip-flops (NVFFs). When power is secured enough again (𝑉𝑚𝑜", it restores the checkpointed register states from the NVFFs and resumes the interrupted program; we assume that the voltage monitoring system is reliable as with all prior works built on JIT checkpointing [20, 43–49, 66, 67]. Alternatively, other approaches [19, 58] store the volatile registers into the (main memory) NVM by using the (software-based) JIT checkpointing mechanism, instead of using a separate hardware NVFF (at the cost of reserving more energy for software-based JIT checkpointing).

Our experiments with 23 applications and 4 different capacitors highlight that WL-Cache always provides significant speedups over the non-volatile cache baseline. With a default capacitor (1uF) where all cache designs deliver the best performance, WL-Cache achieves a 3.1x speedup in the absence of power failure while it does 2.8x and 2.48x speedups for two representative power failure traces, respectively. In particular, WL-Cache even outperforms the ideal NVSRAM cache with a significant margin, achieving 1.35x and 1.44x speedups for the two traces, respectively. Overall, WL-Cache performs the best regardless of the capacitor size.

As light can behave simultaneously as a particle and a wave, WL-Cache takes advantages of both write-through and write-back writing policies; and WL-Cache is “light” weight.
2.2 Cache and Write Policy

A cache allows a system to exploit temporal and spatial locality and thus improves overall performance. Conventional caches employ either write-through or write-back policies, which affect the crash consistency design discussed in the next section. A write-through cache updates both the cache and the main memory at every store. A write-back cache updates only the cache and keeps track of dirty cache lines. It coalesces subsequent write hits on the cache and reduces the write traffic to the main memory, achieving higher performance than the write-through design in many cases.

2.3 Crash Consistency with a Cache

2.3.1 Volatile Write-through Cache. A traditional SRAM-based write-through cache can be used in energy harvesting systems without modification (Figure 1(b)). The write-through policy naturally supports crash consistency by persisting data at every store in a synchronous manner while updating the same data in the cache. However, the requirement of synchronous writes prevents store buffer optimization. The system should pay the long store latency as in the case without a cache. Table 1 (second row) summarizes the pros and cons of write-through cache (WTCache). It does not require extra energy for JIT checkpointing, nor additional hardware (beyond a traditional write-through cache). However, all stores have to travel to NVM, so its performance improvement is limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>HW Cost</th>
<th>Energy Buff. Requirement</th>
<th>NVM Cache Size (Reg.)</th>
<th>Perf. Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTCache</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVCache [6, 18]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVSRAMCache (full) [41]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes (larger)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVSRAMCache (ideal) [16]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes (larger)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVCacheSRAMcache (full, ideal) [16]</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Yes (medium)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVCacheSRAMcache (practical) [16]</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Yes (more)</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Hardware complexity and performance comparison in prior cache schemes for energy harvesting systems.

2.3.2 Non-volatile Write-back Cache. A write-back cache addresses the performance issue of a write-through cache by holding dirty lines in the cache without having synchronous writes. However, it raises the crash consistency problem since the main memory could be outdated upon power outage. For crash consistency, NVCache [6, 18] is designed as a full non-volatile cache, instead of a traditional SRAM-based volatile one, as illustrated in Figure 1(c). However, NVCache is inevitably slower and requires more energy than a traditional SRAM-based cache. As summarized in Table 1 (third row), NVCache does not need to reserve extra energy for JIT checkpointing, but it requires a full non-volatile cache design. The performance impact is limited due to long latency and additional energy consumption. Later we use NVCache as baseline for comparison.

2.3.3 NVSRAMCache. NVSRAMCache [16, 41, 42, 72, 73] couples a traditional write-back SRAM cache with an NVM counterpart as shown in Figure 1(d). It achieves crash consistency via JIT checkpointing: it monitors a remaining energy in a capacitor (energy buffer) and copies the SRAM cache state to the NVM counterpart before a power loss. As listed in Table 1, NVSRAMCache can achieve higher performance improvement as it uses write-back policy and absorbs write hits (unlike WTCache) and it uses a SRAM-based cache at runtime (unlike NVCache). Additionally, NVSRAMCache can resume from a warm cache (as in NVCache). Three versions (full, ideal, and practical) of NVSRAMCache designs have been proposed and they differ in how to achieve crash consistency and associated hardware complexity.

The original NVSRAMCache (full) [41] checkpoints the entire SRAM cache to the NVM counterpart, while the optimized NVSRAMCache (ideal) [16] reduces checkpointing overhead by magically copying “dirty” SRAM cache states only without requiring any additional support. However, note that because all cache lines could be dirty in the worst case, NVSRAMCache (ideal) still needs to reserve the same amount of large energy, enough to JIT checkpoint the entire cache. Moreover, the NVM part is unnecessarily large and mostly wasted because it is used only for checkpointing; therefore, these two versions are impractical. Table 1 lists the high energy buffer requirement and the HW cost as their main downside.

NVSRAMCache (practical) [72, 73] integrates SRAM and NVM cache designs by maintaining SRAM cache lines and NVM cache lines in the same cache set. At runtime, it migrates SRAM cache line to NVM lines (if available). Upon power failure, NVSRAMCache (practical) uses JIT checkpointing to move the (remaining) dirty SRAM lines to NVM lines, i.e., it should ensure that there are enough available NV lines for JIT checkpointing at all times. Therefore, it writes-back dirty NV lines to NVM main memory at runtime, introducing additional traffic to NVM main memory. Besides, in NVSRAMCache (practical), a data may reside in NV lines, yet accessing NV cache lines is slower and consumes more energy than accessing SRAM lines (as in NVCache). Consequently, the performance improvement of NVSRAMCache (practical) is smaller than that of the other designs (Table 1). Though NVSRAMCache (practical) is claimed to be more practical, NVSRAMCache (ideal) can achieve better performance, so we later compare our proposed scheme with NVSRAMCache (ideal). We omit “(ideal)” from now on.

Figure 1: Design comparison of cache architectures in NVP. Gray boxes are non-volatile while white boxes are volatile. Red arrows represent JIT checkpointing.
3 DESIGN OF WL-CACHE

3.1 Overview

WL-Cache is designed on top of a traditional SRAM-based cache with a write-back policy that holds dirty cache lines and avoids NV main memory accesses on every store. However, unlike a traditional write-back cache, WL-Cache limits the possible number of dirty lines at a moment, so that it can failure-atomically flush the bounded number of dirty lines to NVM before power failure by leveraging the JIT checkpointing with a small energy reservoir. For instance, Figure 1(e) shows the case in which WL-Cache allows up to two dirty lines in a cache. By bounding the maximum number of dirty lines, WL-Cache achieves crash consistency without requiring expensive hardware support such as a large energy buffer or an NVM cache counterpart.

WL-Cache tracks dirty cache lines with a small hardware component, called DirtyQueue. When a cache line becomes dirty, WL-Cache inserts its memory address in DirtyQueue. The data remains in the cache (as dirty) and does not become immediately persisted in NVM. When DirtyQueue is about to be full, WL-Cache selects one of the dirty lines and asynchronously writes it back to NVM—though it may not be in the LRU position WL-Cache does not evict the line but leave the data in the cache as clean. When the asynchronous write-back finishes, WL-Cache removes the entry from DirtyQueue to serve later stores.

To manage DirtyQueue, WL-Cache employs two configurable thresholds, i.e., maxline and watermark. The maxline threshold (≤ |DirtyQueue|) defines the maximum number of dirty cache lines in WL-Cache. When the number of dirty cache lines reaches the maxline, WL-Cache stalls a store instruction until a free slot becomes available. In other words, the maxline determines and bounds the amount of energy that WL-Cache needs to secure for checkpointing dirty cache lines to NVM upon a power failure. WL-Cache is more energy-efficient than an alternative NVSRAMCache (ideal) that should reserve a larger amount of energy enough to flush all dirty cache states, e.g., for the worst case that every line is dirty. Initially, the maxline is set to be reasonable number (e.g., maxline = 4) by considering the energy availability of a given energy buffer.

The watermark threshold (maxline) determines when WL-Cache starts writing back a dirty cache line to NVM during a program execution. When the number of dirty lines exceeds watermark, WL-Cache picks a dirty cache line, based on the DirtyQueue replacement policy ($\S5.3$), and asynchronously writes it back to NVM. Note that WL-Cache does not evict a dirty line from the cache (which is separately done by a conventional cache replacement policy). Instead, the persisted (written-back) cache line remains in the cache in a “clean” state for future references; the address of the clean cache line is just removed from DirtyQueue only. WL-Cache exploits instruction level parallelism (ILP) by overlapping the asynchronous write-back operations with the executions of the following instructions.

The gap between maxline and watermark defines the potential ILP opportunity. A high watermark would keep more dirty cachelines in a cache, and should allow WL-Cache to serve more subsequent write hits without traveling to NVM, saving energy and improving performance. However, at the same time, a higher watermark has a risk to stall the following store instructions in case where WL-Cache cannot effectively hide the write-back latency (e.g., a code region with frequent/dense stores). By default, watermark is set to be maxline – 1. So WL-Cache cleans (persists) one cache line at a time. The default setting attempts to make DirtyQueue at least one slot available so that a new dirty line can be added in DirtyQueue with no stall.

Conceptually, one can view WL-Cache with a cache-size maxline (waterline) as a traditional write-back cache; WL-Cache with a zero maxline (waterline) as a write-through cache. WL-Cache interacts with the runtime system that reconfigures the maxline and watermark threshold and thus simultaneously behave as a write-back, write-through, and somewhere between them, depending on the quality/stability of power sources. WL-Cache in effect provides a tuning knob to make the best of two worlds; this will be discussed in §4.

Figure 2 illustrates a running example of WL-Cache. Suppos-edly, DirtyQueue’s maxline is 2 and watermark is 1 in this example. Assumes that the system has enough energy to execute a given program on the top that consists of three store instructions and two arithmetic instructions in between. The first two store instructions introduces two new dirty cache lines and their addresses (0x10000 and 0x20000) are maintained in DirtyQueue as shown in Figure 2 (a) and (b). After the second store, the number of dirty lines exceeds watermark. In response, WL-Cache picks one of dirty cache lines and asynchronously makes it persisted and clean (without eviction). If WL-Cache relies on FIFO-based DirtyQueue replacement policy, WL-Cache writes back the oldest line (0x10000) in DirtyQueue which is mapped to 0x1 tag address in a cache (Figure 2 (c)). In the meantime, a program can make a progress and execute the next ADD and SUB instructions, exploiting ILP. When the asynchronous write-back operation is completed (with the ACK message), WL-Cache removes the corresponding entry from DirtyQueue (Figure 2 (d)). With an empty slot in DirtyQueue, the third store instruction can be served without a stall. If the number of dirty lines reaches maxline (which did not happen in this example), WL-Cache stalls the store instruction and bounds the total number of dirty lines.

3.2 Crash Consistency with WL-Cache

WL-Cache ensures crash consistency using the following checkpointing and recovery protocols. When a voltage drops below the threshold $V_{\text{backup}}$, the voltage monitor signals the processor to checkpoint volatile registers (as in NVP) and volatile dirty cache lines (in DirtyQueue) to the NVM space. In particular, WL-Cache sets the JIT checkpointing voltage threshold ($V_{\text{backup}}$) accordingly to persist the maxline number of cache lines at each reboot time. While WL-Cache needs to reserve more energy than NVP (without a volatile cache) for dirty cache line checkpointing, WL-Cache’s caching benefits are expected to be much higher (as will be shown in our evaluation ($\S6.3$)). During JIT checkpointing, WL-Cache identifies the dirty cache lines based on the memory addresses stored in DirtyQueue using the existing cache lookup control/data path. Then, WL-Cache writes them back to the NVM using the existing cache-memory data path. Note that WL-Cache neither allows more dirty cachelines than it can handle (i.e., a maxline threshold) nor overspends the energy budget for JIT-checkpointing as many dirty lines as the threshold. Once the maxline threshold is (re)configured, WL-Cache adjusts the $V_{\text{backup}}$ voltage accordingly at boot time. This backup energy is set aside for JIT-checkpointing, and thus any dirty line hitting the threshold would be flushed—asynchronously—using additional energy,
Figure 2: Running example of WL-Cache. WL-Cache holds dirty cache lines and keeps track of their memory addresses in DirtyQueue (DQ). When the number of dirty lines exceeds waterline (blue dashed line), WL-Cache asynchronously writes back a dirty line to NVM while a processor executes the next instructions. When the number of dirty lines reaches maxline (red dashed line), WL-Cache stalls the store instruction, bounding the total number of dirty lines in WL-Cache.

not consuming the backup energy. In this way, whether program runs longer or shorter, WL-Cache always secures a sufficient amount of energy to checkpoint the maxline number of dirty cachelines during the program execution.

The recovery protocol after power becomes available again remains simple and the same as that of existing energy harvesting systems. When the capacitor becomes full, energy harvesting systems restore the register states (including instruction pointer) from NVFF for NVP (or from NVM for QuickRecall [20]).

3.3 Discussion

We found that a WTCache with a large write-back buffer can also behave like WL-Cache. However, the alternative design would be inferior to WL-Cache for three issues. First, the design increases HW cost since the large write-back buffer must be backed with content-addressable memory (CAM) search; one might think of a small buffer to reduce CAM search cost, but it would lead to a worse problem, i.e., frequent NVM writes and pipeline stalls. Second, the design is energy-inefficient since the large buffer requires a significant amount of energy to be secured for crash consistency (failure-atomic write-back before outages). Third, the design would suffer performance degradation by extending the critical path of memory access since the write-back buffer must be consulted before accessing memory, i.e., cache miss latency is lengthened.

The key architectural innovation is that WL-Cache decouples the metadata (which cachelines are dirty) from the actual cacheline data. That way WL-Cache does not increase the critical path of memory access thanks to the lack of metadata (DirtyQueue) lookup, e.g., load miss latency remains the same. This enables WL-Cache to achieve a lightweight cache along with its adaptation to varying energy harvesting conditions. Not only that, the decoupled design makes it possible for WL-Cache to realize the DirtyQueue as a volatile structure without compromising the crash consistency guarantee.

4 ADAPTIVE MAXLINE MANAGEMENT

WL-Cache interacts with a runtime system (a system software) that reconfigures maxline and waterline in DirtyQueue. Energy harvesting systems store energy in the capacitor so the recharging time (power-off time) directly depends on the quality of energy source. However, the power-off time is hard to measure. Instead, the WL-Cache runtime system measures a “power-on time” using a watch-dog timer to estimate the quality of energy source. Note that energy harvesting systems continuously collect energy as they execute (during power-on as well). Though every on interval starts from the same level of energy (at the same \( V_{on} \) voltage level of the capacitor), when the harvesting condition is good, the system may run longer.

Based on the observation, WL-Cache runtime system estimates the energy source quality from the past power-on times, and adjusts the maxline and waterline thresholds at each boot time. Once set, they remain the same during execution (until energy drains). Changing the thresholds while running could be dangerous as energy harvesting systems may not be able to guarantee JIT checkpointing.

For adaptive management, WL-Cache compares the power-on times of the last two intervals \( (T_{n-2} \) and \( T_{n-1} \)) to determine the maxline and waterline thresholds of the next interval \( (\text{maxline}_n \) and \( \text{waterline}_n \)). If the measured power-on time increases significantly, it implies that the energy source quality is good, and thus the system adaptively raises maxline and waterline. With the higher maxline, WL-Cache attempts to take more advantage of locality like a write-back cache. In contrast, if the power-on time decreases, implying a poor energy source condition, the system lowers maxline and waterline because it is better to avoid a large voltage margin. Otherwise, the two thresholds remain the same. Once the maxline is determined, the runtime system also need to adjust the voltage margin \( V_{backup} \) large enough to JIT-checkpoint the maxline number of dirty cache lines at boot time.

Figure 3 describes an example execution in which the maxline and waterline are reconfigured. Supposedly, at the beginning of a program execution, the maxline and waterline in DirtyQueue are 3 and 2, respectively. When the capacitor voltage level reaches \( V_{on} \), the system boots on (the first boot) and runs. When the voltage level becomes below \( V_{backup} \), the system initiates JIT checkpointing of volatile registers and (maxline) dirty cache lines. The system also stores its power-on time for the first interval \( (T_1) \). Suppose now the energy source condition becomes much better. The system recharges energy quickly and it makes more forward progress. Upon the third boot, the system detects that the power-on time of the second interval \( (T_2) \) becomes much longer than that of the first interval \( (T_1) \). It increases the maxline and waterline thresholds (4 and 3, respectively) as well as the voltage margin \( V_{backup} \) accordingly. The reconfiguration allows the system to hold more dirty cache lines during the execution of the third interval, providing more opportunity to exploit locality. There is no big change in the power-on times of
WL-Cache leaves an at least one space empty (§4); therefore, the pipeline to charge the capacitor. For example, when the number of dirty lines reaches the maxline, WL-Cache checks the residual energy in the capacitor. If the energy is sufficient to JIT-checkpoint another line, WL-Cache increases the maxline by 1 while raising \( V_{\text{backup}} \) as the number of dirty cache lines increases. Note that WL-Cache performs such dynamic adaptation opportunistically, i.e., if the capacitor energy cannot afford a new line, we would rather write back one of the dirty lines tracked by DirtyQueue than stall the pipeline to charge the capacitor. For example, when the number of dirty lines reaches the maxline, WL-Cache checks the residual energy in the capacitor. If the energy is sufficient to JIT-checkpoint another line, WL-Cache increases the maxline by 1 while raising \( V_{\text{backup}} \) accordingly. We found that the dynamic adaptation works better than the static adaptation when the energy source is strong; this will be discussed in §6.

5 WL-CACHE POLICY AND PROTOCOLS

5.1 DirtyQueue Insertion Protocol

When a cache line becomes dirty, WL-Cache first checks if there is an empty space in DirtyQueue by comparing the maxline and the number of dirty lines (a tail of the circular queue). If available, the corresponding store address is appended in DirtyQueue. Otherwise, the store instruction stalls until an empty slot becomes available. The subsequent store instructions to the same dirty line (i.e., no dirty state change) does not trigger an interaction between a cache and DirtyQueue. Note that, thanks to the waterline constraint, WL-Cache leaves an at least one space empty (§4); therefore, the stall rarely occurs.

5.2 DirtyQueue Replacement Policy

When the number of total dirty cache lines exceeds the waterline, WL-Cache selects a dirty line to write back in NVM. We refer to the decision process as a “DirtyQueue replacement policy” to differentiate it from a traditional cache replacement policy since WL-Cache does not evict it but cleans it. WL-Cache supports FIFO and LRU replacement policies.

5.3 DirtyQueue Replacement Protocol

After a dirty line is selected according to the above DirtyQueue replacement policy, WL-Cache asynchronously write-backs the dirty cache line using the following four steps. (1) WL-Cache marks the cache line clean without eviction, (2) WL-Cache sends an asynchronous write-back request, (3) WL-Cache waits for the delivery of an ACK message (acknowledging the completion of the write-back operation). In the meantime, a processor executes the subsequent instructions, and (4) upon ACK, WL-Cache removes the associated slot from DirtyQueue. For FIFO policy, it will be always the head. The LRU-based scheme requires search.

Figure 2 (c) illustrates the first and the second steps in which the cache line of Tag 0x1 (Address 0x10000) becomes clean then persisted in NVM. At the moment, the processor executes ADD instruction (exploiting ILP). Figure 2 (d) shows the next two steps where the ACK message is delivered and the DQ entry (head, Address 0x10000) is removed.

Removing the associated entry in DirtyQueue last (Step 4) ensures that if a power fails any step before Step 4, WL-Cache can still safely find the entry in DirtyQueue and perform JIT-checkpointing of the dirty cache line, regardless of whether the write-back request (Step 2) has been fulfilled or not. If completed, WL-Cache may (redundantly) write back the cache line again, yet there is no correctness issue. If write-back is not done, WL-Cache will persist the cache line, making the NVM state consistent across a power failure.

Marking the cache line clean first (Step 1) ensures the correctness even when the store instruction to the same cache line is executed while the cache line is being written back asynchronously (Step 3). Suppose we have two stores to the same memory location \( X \), say \( WX = 1 \) and \( WX = 2 \), and some other instructions in between. The first store \( WX = 1 \) makes the cache line \( X = 1 \) and dirty. Let’s say DirtyQueue becomes full (by other store instructions) and the cache line \( X \) is selected to be cleaned. The protocol first marks the cache line clean (Step 1) and then start a write-back operation (Step 2). Suppose at the moment, the second store \( WX = 2 \) performs. Now we demonstrate what could go wrong if the cache line is not marked clean (not doing Step 1 first).

If the cache line remains dirty, the second store will not find a state transition to dirty, so it will not update DirtyQueue. The second store will make the cache line \( X = 2 \) and dirty. Suppose the write-back operation of the first store finishes (NVM now has \( X = 1 \), and the address \( X \) is removed from DirtyQueue (Step 3).
We implemented WL-Cache on gem5 [7] with ARM ISA, modeling a single core in-order processor. For power failure simulation, we used NVPsim [16] with the same core model. We compared WL-Cache to (1) non-volatile write-back cache (NVCache-WB) [6, 18], (2) volatile write-through SRAM-based cache (VCache-WT), (3) VCache-WB with ReplayCache compiler (ReplayCache) [75], and (4) the state-of-the-art NVRAM cache that uses ReRAM as the SRAM cache backup storage, with a write-back policy (NVSRAM-WB) [65]; we set this as an ideal design that can checkpoint only dirty lines from SRAM to ReRAM at power-off point. We used Mediabench [31] and MiBench [17] compiled with -O3 optimization.

As a default configuration, we use volatile L1 instruction and data caches as with the prior work [41, 75] (see Table 2). For WL-Cache, we use the FIFO for DirtyQueue replacement policy and LRU for cache replacement policy as default; we varied the policies for sensitivity analysis (§6.5). Also, we set the DirtyQueue size to 8 and the maxline to 6 as default (i.e., the waterline is 5), then we enable the adaptive threshold management (§4) to reconfigure maxline and waterline, accordingly.

To evaluate WL-Cache in realistic energy harvesting situations, we used the same two power traces, i.e., Trace 1 and Trace 2, of the NVPsim which were collected from real RF sources [16, 75]; Trace 1 and 2 are from home and office, respectively. Trace 2 is relatively more stable than Trace 1.

## 6.2 Hardware Cost
We analyzed the hardware cost of WL-Cache by using CACTI [62] with 90 nm technology. WL-Cache requires at most 0.005 mm² area and 0.0008 nJ (dynamic access). Furthermore, the total leakage power of WL-Cache (DirtyQueue with a logic) causes only 0.1mW in total, which is only 9% of NV cache leakage [16, 73, 75].

## 6.3 Performance Analysis

### Performance Analysis without Power Outages

For performance analysis, we set the baseline to be NVSRAM-WB [65] and compared with NVCache-WB [6, 18], VCache-WT, ReplayCache with VCache-WB [75], and WL-Cache. Figure 4 shows the speedup when there is no power failure. Overall, WL-Cache shows a similar speedup to NVSRAM-WB, achieving a 3.1x speedup on average.

The baseline NVSRAM-WB is the fastest cache design for Non-volatile processor (NVP) [75]. On the other hand, NVCache-WB is the slowest as it has to pay long latency for every nonvolatile cache access. VCache-WT could take advantage of (SRAM-based) fast cache hits. ReplayCache improves the performance since it overlaps the next instruction execution with NVM stores of the same region. ReplayCache shows the best performance among all designs, demonstrating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 I/D Cache</th>
<th>8kB, 2-way, 64B block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cache Latencies (lat/miss)</td>
<td>NVRAM1(1.9/1.5), NVSRAM1(3.1/3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVM (ReRAM) Latency (ns)</td>
<td>0.9(7)/5/18/15/7.5/150/30 (NVRAM1/2/3/1/1/4/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy buffer (capacitor)</td>
<td>[μF] [46, 69]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vbackups/store</td>
<td>NV(2/3/5), NVSRAM(3/5/5), VCache-WT(3/5/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmin/max</td>
<td>NV(1/3/5), NVSRAM(2/3/5), VCache-WT(3/5/5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Simulation configuration.
Figure 4: Normalized speedup of each cache design compared to NVSRAM(ideal) with no power failure.

Figure 5: Normalized speedup of each cache design compared to NVSRAM(ideal) in Power Trace 1.

Figure 6: Normalized speedup of each cache design compared to NVSRAM(ideal) in Power Trace 2.

Figure 7: Normalized write traffic increase compared to NVSRAM(ideal) in Power Trace 1.

Figure 8: Normalized speedup of WL-Cache with different DirtyQueue replacement and different cache set associativity compared to NVSRAM(ideal) on average.

the benefit of write-back. WL-Cache was slower than NVSRAM-WB, implying that WL-Cache could hold enough dirty cache lines. With waterline-based write-back, WL-Cache did not suffer much from potential stalls. WL-Cache also effectively hide the cost of asynchronous write-back operation, exploiting ILP.

**Performance Analysis with Power Outages:** Figure 5 and 6 show the speedup of each cache design using Power Trace 1 and 2, respectively. We took into account both power-on and power-off periods in this experiment.

For all applications, WL-Cache shows the best performance among all designs. WL-Cache achieves on average about 1.09x and 1.12x speedup compared to the baseline in Trace 1 and 2, respectively. WL-Cache is 225% and 198% faster than NVCache-WB, 71% and 55% faster than VCache-WT, and 32% and 30% faster than Replay-Cache in Trace 1 and 2, respectively, demonstrating the benefits of holding dirty cache lines and exploiting cache locality. Upon a power failure, WL-Cache needs to persist a bounded number of dirty cache lines, whereas NVCache-WB should reserve more energy to support cache backup. With less energy reserved for JIT checkpointing, WL-Cache could efficiently use the energy to compute and make a further forward progress.

**Write Traffic with Power Outages:** Figure 7 shows the write traffic overhead of WL-Cache compared to NVSRAM-WB cache using Trace 1. The result demonstrates that WL-Cache slightly increases the write traffic; however, it can be paid off by enabling asynchronous write back and adaptive execution as proven in Figure 5.
potential benefits of LRU, and the cache is often not warm enough when the maxline changes from 2 to 8 along with different replacement policies. WL-Cache shows good performance with maxline 4 or 6. The performance differences between maxline 4 and 6 are not significant. Trace 1 and 2, due to additional power consumption for that LRU lookup logic. WL-Cache uses the FIFO-based DirtyQueue replacement policy by default.

### 6.5 Sensitivity Analysis
We conducted sensitivity analysis on WL-Cache by varying the maxline size, cache replacement policy (LRU and FIFO), set associativity, cache size, capacitor size, power trace, and adaptive mechanism. Notably, we explore cache replacement policy in this section (with FIFO-based DirtyQueue replacement policy). For analysis, we used the same baseline (i.e., NVSRAM-WB) and measured the performance of each cache design using Trace 1. Figure 9 shows the results.

#### Set-associative Cache Variation:
We varied cache associativity and measured the execution time of each design. Figure 8(b) shows that the direct-mapped cache is the slowest design; it is slower than the baseline. On the other hand, 2-way and 4-way set-associative cache design show similar performance. In particular, the 4-way set-associative cache is slightly slower than 2-way set-associative cache in Trace 1 and 2, due to additional power consumption. WL-Cache uses the 2-way set-associative cache by default.

#### Maxline Variation:
We investigate how its performance varies when the maxline changes from 2 to 8 along with different replacement policies. WL-Cache shows good performance with maxline 4 or 6. The performance differences between maxline 4 and 6 are not significant.
Figure 11: Normalized speedup of WL-Cache with adaptive management compared to NVSRAM(ideal) in Power Trace 1.

Figure 12: Normalized speedup of WL-Cache with adaptive management compared to NVSRAM(ideal) in Power Trace 2.

Figure 13: Performance analysis across power traces (a) and energy consumption breakdown using Power Trace 1 (b).

First, the impact of cache replacement policy on cache miss rate is limited. We found that both policies cause almost the same cache miss rates. Energy harvesting systems experience frequent power failures, and they wake up with a “cold” cache—that has no data—across power failure. Therefore, WL-Cache is likely to cause compulsory (cold) misses across power failure regardless of the replacement policy. Furthermore, the systems run applications for a short amount of time. Within the limited time, the room for a smart cache replacement policy to address other conflict misses is simply small.

Second, the FIFO policy is energy-efficient without requiring additional cost to track LRU/MRU list at every memory access unlike LRU, that takes more latency and consumes more power possibly causing more power outages; we found LRU caused more power outages for most of applications.

Cache Size Variation: Figure 10(a) illustrates that the normalized performance speedup of alternative cache schemes with a different cache size from 128B to 4KB using Power Trace 1. The results indicate that the performance gap between WL-Cache and NVSRAM-WB is decreased when the cache size is decreased, and vice versa; the speedup is also increased as the cache size increases.

Capacitor Size Variation: For capacitor size sensitivity analysis, we used NVSRAM(ideal) with 1uF as baseline, and measured the performance of alternative cache design with a different capacitor size from 100nF to 1mF using Power Trace 1. Figure 10(b) describes the normalized performance speedup of alternative cache schemes. In particular, all schemes show their best performance when the capacitor size is 1uF. However, when the capacitor size is increased more than 1uF, their performance is exponentially decreased. This is mainly because their charging time is increased when the capacitor size is increased. On the other hand, the performance gap between WL-Cache and NVSRAM-WB is decreased when the capacitor size is increased. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to take the diminishing gain to mean that such a large capacitor is the norm because the best performance is achieved with 1uF capacitor where WL-Cache does not take advantage of dirty cache lines and locality.

Cache Replacement Variation: Figure 9 shows that FIFO-based WL-Cache (black line) outperforms LRU-based WL-Cache (blue dotted line) for cache replacement policies. When compared to NVSRAM-WB (red dotted line), FIFO-based WL-Cache performs better for almost all applications in all the maxline settings. For general purpose systems, LRU normally performs better compared to FIFO. However, for energy harvesting systems with frequent power outages, we found FIFO is always faster than LRU. Further investigation reveals two main reasons for this surprising result.
significantly outperforms NVSRAM-WB achieving 1.35x and 1.44x average speedups for Trace 1 and Trace 2, respectively.

6.6 Maxline/Waterline Threshold Adaptation
The above section motivates WL-Cache’s adaptive maxline (and waterline) management optimization ($\S$4). For comparison, we measured the performance gain of “adaptive” WL-Cache with FIFO and LRU replacement policies and compared them to “static” WL-Cache. For the fixed settings, we picked the best performing maxline size for each application as we found in Figure 9. Figures 11 and 12 show the results for Trace 1 and 2, respectively. Adaptive WL-Cache outperforms static-Best WL-Cache for both FIFO- and LRU- cache replacement schemes. Overall, for Trace 1, FIFO (Adap) and LRU (Adap) achieve 1.35x and 1.18x speedups, respectively, while FIFO (Best) and LRU (Best) do 1.26x and 1.1x speedups, respectively. For power trace 2, FIFO (Adap/Best) and LRU (Adap/Best) earn speedups of 1.44x/1.3x and 1.24x/1.15x, respectively.

On average, WL-Cache reconfigures the maxline (and waterline) thresholds 11 and 12 times on trace 1 and 2, respectively. The minimum and maximum values of maxline are 2 and 6 for both traces. The energy source prediction accuracy is >98%, and thus the impact of mis-prediction is minimal in both traces. With adaptive threshold management, we also measured the number of dirty lines and the number of write-backs during each power-on period on average, which are 6/3 and 6/2 (dirty-lines/write-backs) in trace 1 and 2, respectively. In addition, the pipeline stall causes a negligible delay, <1% of the total execution time on average in both traces.

Power Trace Sensitivity: We conducted additional experiments with another RF trace (tr.3 [57]) as well as solar and thermal traces [16]. Figure 13(a) shows that WL-Cache outperforms all others significantly for all RF traces yet achieves only 8% and 2% speedups over NVSRAM (ideal) for solar and thermal traces, respectively. This is because NVSRAM works better in stable environment such as solar and thermal (as shown in Figure 4); the numbers of power outages in tr.1/tr.2/tr.3/solar/thermal are 33/45/121/12/9, respectively, on average during the entire program execution. In particular, such frequent outages in tr.3 make NVSRAM perform the worst among all tested cache designs.

Adaptation Sensitivity: We also tested the dynamic adaptation scheme ($\S$4) shown as WL-Cache (dyn) in Figure 13(a); it outperforms WL-Cache by about 5% and 3% for solar and thermal traces, respectively. This is because by raising the maxline during program execution, WL-Cache (dyn) can reduce the number of writebacks—especially when the following stores fall into the lines of DirtyQueue which would otherwise be written back in NVM due to the waterline constraint. However, it is slower than WL-Cache for all RF traces that are less stable than others; it turns out that even if WL-Cache (dyn) manages to increase the maxline with $V_{\text{backup}}$ raised, power failure often occurs before the writeback reduction effect kicks in. In the presence of unstable power, such premature $V_{\text{backup}}$ raise leaves a less amount energy for computation at run time and delays the booting time without much gain, thus ending up with more failure and performance degradation compared to WL-Cache.

6.7 Energy Consumption Analysis
We measured energy consumption of WL-Cache and compared it to other cache designs with power outages for each part of the system:

7 RELATED WORK
To improve cache performance, a prior work introduces an eager write-back cache [32] that opportunistically flushes lines when memory bus is idle. Unfortunately, the prior work was designed without considering neither crash consistency nor energy efficiency that are essential for energy harvesting systems. In addition, many prior studies have leveraged the eager write-back cache for various purposes, e.g., reliability enhancement [5, 27, 33, 60], NVM crash consistency guarantee [4, 29, 52, 74], and performance optimization [24, 25, 59, 64], as shown in Table 3. However, they are not applicable to energy harvesting systems that require high energy efficiency as well as whole system persistence (WSP) [23, 53]. Apart from the power-hungry hardware support, they require either persistent programming [29, 52] with a separated (persist) data-path and a large battery [4, 29, 74], customized TLB [25, 59], or additional cache structure [5, 27, 33, 60].

8 CONCLUSION
This paper presents WL-Cache, new cache organization with a hybrid write policy for energy harvesting systems. WL-Cache is neither write-through nor write-back caches. It combines the benefits of write-back caches (efficiency) and write-through caches (persistence) without their downsides. To achieve this, WL-Cache controls the maximum number of dirty cache lines that it manages to just-in-time checkpoint upon power failure; if the number gets bigger (smaller), WL-Cache acts more like a write-back (write-through) cache. For optimization, WL-Cache estimates the underlying energy harvesting quality by analyzing power-on times, and adjusts the number of manageable dirty cache lines correspondingly. Our evaluation highlights that WL-Cache outperforms all existing cache designs significantly.
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