Top40 cache

Compared to LRU and LFU

Alain van Hoof

February 4, 2009

Research Question

\begin{quotation}
How does the by NPO-ICT created and used
cache algorithm compares to other cache
algorithms in the same environment.
\end{quotation}

On demand Streaming Media NPO-ICT



Media Stream Servers

Media Streamserver(s)

>50T Storage Array

Media Stream Servers





>50T Storage Array



>50T Storage Array

A special cache?

- Read-Only
- Seconds
- 4 GB, I26GB and 640GB!
- Single Cache Miss is "No Problem"
- Cache Insert is expensive (copy of MB's)

Simulation Environment

- Real Input Data (Archived)
- 11 days in January 2009 (Thu 08 Sun 18)
- LRU and LFU written in Perl
- Cache and Storage are a Database
- Modified Streamcache-mgr © D.Snippe

Input Data each 60 seconds

pois|68|/ceres/avro/rest/2009/AVRO_1316544/bb.20090108.asf pois|43|/ceres/kro/rest/2009/KRO_1316814/bb.20090107.asf pois|34|/ceres/bnn/rest/2009/POW_00212208/bb.20090108.asf pois|27|/nos/journaal/laatstejournaalBB.wmv





Percentage of Requests

LRU: Least Recently Used

When inserting a file into the cache delete oldest file from cache

LFU: Least Frequently Used

When inserting a file into the cache, delete least requested file from cache Note: LFU cache Aging to avoid pollution

Top40

- Heavily modified LFU
- Ignores one-time request
- A "chart" of weights
- Files only removed from cache when below threshold
- Files only inserted when above threshold (from nothing to number one)

Results 4GB Wed-12



Results 128GB Wed-12



Results 640GB Wed-12



Conclusion

Hit-rate: Top40 keeps up with LFU/LRU
Inserts: Top40 all-most zero, unlike LRU/LFU
Inserts are unwanted, Mediafiles are Big!
Compared to other cache algorithms in the same environment, Top40 is performing much better

Thanks!



Dick Snippe

Writer of streamcache-mgr and the Top40 algorithm

