1 Introduction

Experienced capacity planners know that every new generation of machines provides a major challenge to their skills. However, by using LSPR benchmarks and the recent zPCR tool, they have always been able to overcome this issue.

Unfortunately, the latest and only benchmarks for z/OS 1.11 are Low, Average and High RNI (forget about LoI-Mix, Di-Mix, etc.), and these are the only benchmarks available for the z196 mainframes. Any upgrade from z9 and z10 models to these machines will therefore require special care.

This paper discusses these issues, providing information and suggestions on how to perform accurate machine capacity evaluations and comparisons.

This paper will also give a preliminary description of the LSPR benchmarks, z10 and z196 processor hardware architecture, and the new metrics available through the CPU Measurement Facility, which allows you to measure each processor cache level and determine the real capacity of a machine.

2 Old LSPR benchmarks

IBM’s Large Systems Performance Reference (LSPR), is a method designed to provide relative processor capacity data for IBM mainframes. It is based on a set of measured benchmarks representing specific workload environments.

These base benchmarks are also called “workload primitives”. In the past, their names directly recalled application characteristics (e.g. CICS, IMS, etc.), while in recent years their names have become less specific.

LSPR workload primitives published for z/OS 1.9 are:

- ODE-B, On Demand Environment Batch;
- CB-L, Commercial Batch Long Job Steps;
- WASDB, WebSphere Application Server and Data Base;
- OLTP-T, Traditional On-line Workload;
As it is very unlikely that a z/OS system runs only one type of workload, IBM decided to create workload mixes by combining the above primitives.

LSPR workload mixes published for z/OS 1.9 are:

- LoIO-Mix, low DASD I/O rate;
- CB-Mix, commercial batch;
- TM-Mix, transaction moderate;
- TD-Mix, transaction dominant;
- Ti-Mix transaction intensive;
- DI-Mix, data intensive;
- LSPR-Mix, a kind of average mix normally used in contracts\(^1\); however, IBM recommends against using it for Capacity Planning.

Mainframe capacity has always been closely associated with how a workload uses and interacts with a particular processor hardware design. However, this information was not available in the past so “external” metrics, such as DASD I/O rate or % of online workloads have always been used, assuming they generally corresponded to the “internal” workload/processor hardware interaction.

According to IBM (and our experience), the workload that best represents most z/OS production systems is the LoIO-Mix. The good news, is that it can easily be identified by calculating the ratio between the DASD I/O rate and the MSU used. If this ratio is less than 30, the workload can be considered as LoIO.

This is a typical algorithm used to determine the workload characteristics of a z/OS system:

1. Check if the ratio between DASD I/O rate and MSU used is less than 30; if yes choose LoIO Mix;
2. If the ratio is greater than 30, analyze the system workload, trying to estimate the portion of CPU used by online and other workloads\(^2\); if online is less than 25% choose CB-Mix;
3. If online is between 25% and 35% choose TM-Mix;
4. If online is between 35% and 55% choose TD-Mix;
5. If online is more than 55% choose Ti-Mix.

\(^1\) IBM now uses PCI (Processor Capacity Index), values which essentially are LSPR-Mix rounded values.
\(^2\) We do that by aggregating SMF30 interval using the program name; this is calculated automatically in EPV for z/OS
In the graph shown in Figure 1, the IBM 2097-730 capacity estimates based on both workload primitives and mixes are presented. It’s easy to understand the importance of using the right workload: the difference in capacity between LoIo-Mix and DI-Mix is in fact more than 4,000 MIPS.

The bad news, is that a DI-Mix workload may look like LoIo because of the low DASD I/O rate to MSU ratio, but it stresses the processor cache architecture, causing a big reduction of the usable capacity. Unfortunately, there is no way to identify a DI-Mix workload by using “external” metrics and rules. A new metric category is required. We will discuss that in the following chapters.
3 z10 and z196 processor hardware design

Figure 2 shows a simplified view of the z10 processor cache architecture.

If data and instructions to be processed are found in the Level 1 cache (L1), dedicated to each processor, this is called a “cache hit”. In this case the speed of the clock can be well exploited.

If data and instructions cannot be found in L1, the hardware tries to load them from the Level 1.5 (L1.5) cache, which is still a cache dedicated to each processor, from the Level 2 cache (L2) of the same book, from the Level 2 cache (L2), of another book, from local memory, or remote memory - in this order.

In this case, a “cache miss” occurs and clock cycles are lost while waiting for data and instructions to be loaded in the L1 cache. The number of lost cycles really depends on the cache level accessed, ranging from a few cycles for L1.5 to hundreds of cycles for memory.

---
3 There are two L1 caches, one for data the other for instructions, dedicated to each processor but for simplicity only one cache is depicted in the figure.
4 L2 serves all the processors in a book.
The same concepts apply to the z196 processor cache architecture presented in Figure 3. The main difference, compared to the z10, is the addition of the Level 3 (L3), cache, which is a cache serving all the processors on the same chip\(^5\).

The bottom line is:

"Workload capacity performance will be quite sensitive to how deep into the memory hierarchy the processor must go to retrieve the workload's instructions and data for execution. Best performance occurs when the instructions and data are found in the cache(s) nearest the processor so that little time is spent waiting prior to execution; as instructions and data must be retrieved from farther out in the hierarchy, the processor spends more time waiting for their arrival.\(^6\)"

The two main factors determining workload performance are:

- Percentage of L1 misses over total searches;
- Percentage of L1 misses satisfied by each cache level, (including memory).

In the next chapter we will show how to calculate them.

---

\(^5\) L1.5 has been renamed to L2 and the former L2, (the book cache), has been renamed to L4.

\(^6\) From IBM Large Systems Performance Reference.
4 CPU Measurement Facility

A new hardware facility called “CPU Measurement Facility” (CPU MF), was introduced with z10 machines. The CPU MF, together with the new z/OS Hardware Instrumentation Services (HIS), provides the ability to gain measurements on processor cache effectiveness.

To collect these measurements, you need to perform the following steps:

- Authorize the sampling facilities and counter set types you want to use through the support element (SE) console (only counters need to be activated);
- Define a user ID for the HIS started task (provided in SYS1.PROCLIB);
- Define the user ID with a segment that specifies a default UID and a default HOME directory;
- Create the HOME directory of the user ID in a local file system;
- Enable SMF record type 113 writing in the SMFPRMxx member of the SYS1.PARMLIB;
- Start the HIS by executing the S HIS command;
- Activate data collection by issuing the following command:
  
  F HIS,B,TT='COUNTERS',PATH='/var/his',CTRONLY,CTR=ALL

Collected information are recorded in SMF 113 and in a USS file written in the HOME directory.

BASIC COUNTERS

Six metrics are provided in the Basic Counters section:

- B0, CYCLE COUNT
- B1, INSTRUCTION COUNT
- B2, L1 I-CACHE DIRECTORY-WRITE COUNT
- B3, L1 I-CACHE PENALTY CYCLE COUNT
- B4, L1 D-CACHE DIRECTORY-WRITE COUNT
- B5, L1 D-CACHE PENALTY CYCLE COUNT

Starting from these measurements, the percentage of L1 misses over total searches can be calculated by using the following formula:

\[ \%L1\ Miss = \left( \frac{B2 + B4}{B1} \right) \times 100 \]

The following figure (Figure 4), presents a portion of the output USS file, produced when HIS data collection ends7.

Required measurements are identified, translated to decimal, and used to calculate the \%L1 Miss value.

The output refers to a z10 machine (see CPU SPEED value), but the \%L1 Miss formula works for both z10 and z196 machines.

---

7 Only CPU 00 counters are presented in the example, a counter section per each processor is provided.
Eight metrics are provided in the Extended Counters section on z10 machines:

- E128, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L1.5 (instructions);
- E129, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L1.5 (data);
- E130, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOCAL L2 (instructions);
- E131, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOCAL L2 (data);
- E132, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM REMOTE L2 (instructions);
- E133, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM REMOTE L2 (data);
- E134, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOCAL MEMORY (data);
- E135, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOCAL MEMORY (instructions).

Starting from these measurements, the percentage of L1 misses sourced by each cache level can be calculated by using the following formulas:

\[ \%L1.5 = \frac{(E128+E129)}{(B2+B4)} \times 100 = 64,6 \]
\[ \%L2L = \frac{(E130+E131)}{(B2+B4)} \times 100 = 14,4 \]
\[ \%L2R = \frac{(E132+E133)}{(B2+B4)} \times 100 = 0,9 \]
\[ %\text{MEML} = \frac{(E134+E135)}{(B2+B4)} \times 100 = 9,2 \]
By summing all the calculated percentages you might not get 100%. The reason is that some L1 Misses may be sourced by remote memory (memory on a different book). No counters are provided but you can easily calculate that percentage by using the following formula:

\[
\%\text{MEMR} = \frac{(B2+B4 - \text{Sum}(E128:E134))}{(B2+B4)} \times 100 = 10.9
\]

The same logic but different calculations have to be performed for z196 by using new extended counters. Unfortunately no official IBM documentation has been published at the time of writing\(^8\).

5 **Relative Nest Intensity (RNI)**

Only three z/OS 1.11 benchmarks are available: Low RNI, AVG RNI and High RNI. RNI means Relative Nest Intensity; it indicates the level of activity to the most performance-sensitive area of the memory hierarchy: shared caches and memory. This part of the memory hierarchy is called the “Nest”.

\(^8\) Some information is provided in the John Burg “CPU MF – the Lucky 113s – z196 Update and WSC Experiences” presentation. Complete documentation should be provided in “The CPU-Measurement Facility Extended Counters Definition for z10 and z196” manual (SA23-2261-01).
In Figure 6, the z196 Nest has been highlighted. For this machine generation it is composed of L3 cache (shared by all the processors in the same chip), L4 cache (shared by all the processors in the same book), and memory.

As discussed previously, workload capacity performance is quite sensitive to how deep into the memory hierarchy the processor must go in order to retrieve the workload's instructions and data to be executed. So the higher the RNI, the worse the workload capacity performance will be.

In practical terms, the machine will look less powerful to a workload presenting High RNI characteristics than to a workload presenting AVG RNI or Low RNI characteristics.

The following formulas allow us to calculate the RNI of a system, depending on the machine generation, starting from the Extended Counters discussed in the previous chapter:

\[
\begin{align*}
    z10 \text{ RNI} &= (1.0 \times \%L2L + 2.4 \times \%L2R + 7.5 \times \%\text{MEM}) / 100 \\
    z196 \text{ RNI} &= (1.6 \times (0.4 \times \%L3 + 1.0 \times \%L4L + 2.4 \times \%L4R + 7.5 \times \%\text{MEM})) / 100
\end{align*}
\]

It’s interesting to note that:

- z10 L2L corresponds to z196 L4L;
- z10 L2R corresponds to z196 L4R;
- L3 doesn’t exist in z10 machines.
The coefficients in **bold** are used to weight cache and memory accesses, so in both formulas:

- Accessing the local book cache (L2L or L4L), is weighted 1;
- Accessing a remote book cache (L2R or L4R), is weighted 2.4;
- Accessing memory (including both local and remote book memory), is weighted 7.5.

The z196 formula looks a bit more complex because it includes L3 cache accesses (weighted 0.4), and an additional coefficient (1.6), to increase the resulting RNI value.

### 6 z/OS 1.11 benchmarks

Low, AVG and High RNI are the only benchmarks available for z196. To allow customers to compare current machines (mostly z9 and z10), with the newer ones, these benchmarks have been published for all the existing IBM machines too.

Unfortunately, all of the capacity planning studies for the existing machines have been performed using different benchmarks, so customers will need a *“bridge”* to the new benchmarks when evaluating an upgrade to z196.

IBM has provided two guidelines to assist in bridging to new benchmarks:

- if the workload used to be LoI0-Mix then use AVG RNI;
- if the workload used to be DI-Mix then use High RNI.

![Figure 7](image-url)
Figures 7 and 8 show a comparison of the expected capacity of z9 and z10 models based on LoIO-Mix and AVG RNI benchmarks.

LoIO-Mix is represented by a continuous line and AVG RNI by a dotted line. The orange area represents the increase or decrease in capacity when using AVG RNI instead of LoIO-Mix.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 8**

LoIO-Mix is represented by a continuous line and AVG RNI by a dotted line. The orange area represents the increase or decrease in capacity when using AVG RNI instead of LoIO-Mix.

When using AVG RNI instead of LoIO-Mix the z9 capacity is about 2% lower. Capacity decrease for the biggest model is about 3% (560 MIPS). See Figure 7.

When using AVG RNI instead of LoIO-Mix, the z10 capacity is about 2.5% lower. Also in this case, capacity decrease for the biggest model is about 3% (1,012 MIPS). See Figure 8.
The following graphs (See figures 9 and 10), show a comparison of the expected capacity of z9 and z10 models based on DI-Mix and High RNI benchmarks. DI-Mix is represented by a continuous line and High RNI by a dotted line. The orange area represents the increase or decrease in capacity when using High RNI instead of DI-Mix.

When using High RNI instead of DI-Mix, the z9 capacity, starting from the 708 model, is higher. Capacity increase for the biggest model is about 12% (1,827 MIPS). See Figure 9.
When using High RNI instead of DI-Mix the z10 capacity, also in this case starting from the 708 model, is greater. Capacity increase for the biggest model is about 11% (2,711 MIPS). See Figure 10. It’s also interesting to compare new and old PCI\(^9\) (Processor Capacity Index) values. See Figures 11 and 12 below. These are the numbers used by managers when discussing contracts and prices with IBM, so they are also very important.

\(9\) PCI used to be based on LSPR-Mix, (harmonic mean of LSPR workload primitives); its values now look very close to AVG RNI.

---

**Figure 11**

**Figure 12**
z9 new PCI numbers, starting from the 713 model, are higher than the old ones. Capacity increase for the biggest model is about 2.3% (420 MIPS). See Figure 11.

z10 new PCI numbers, starting from the 713 model, are higher than the old ones. Capacity increase for the biggest model is about 3.3% (1,015 MIPS). See Figure 12.

From the graphs above, it appears evident that moving from the old to new z/OS benchmarks, using only the IBM guidelines its not straightforward.

A better alternative, is collecting MF counters, as described in the previous chapters, and evaluating your workload %L1 Miss (percentage of L1 cache miss), and RNI. Once done, you can classify the workload by using the following rules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% L1 Miss</th>
<th>RNI</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3%</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.75</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>&gt; 1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>0.60 to 1.00</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.60</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6%</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.75</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13

7 Using zPCR

For some years IBM has made the zPCR tool available. Using zPCR, a user can easily evaluate his machine capacity, taking into account the specific machine configuration instead of using LSPR tables\(^{10}\).

To evaluate a z196 machine capacity, zPCR 7.1a is required. The reference CPU, to be used when performing zPCR studies, is still the 2094-701 but its capacity has to be reduced from 602 to 593 MIPS, when using the 7.1a version.

When you load a study created with previous zPCR versions, and therefore based on old benchmarks, the workload characteristics are automatically changed as follows:

- CB-Mix to AVG RNI,
- LoIO-Mix to AVG RNI,
- TM-Mix to AVG-High RNI,
- TD-Mix to AVG-High RNI,
- Ti-Mix to AVG-High RNI,
- DI-Mix to High RNI.

\(^{10}\) LSPR tables are based on an average configuration not representing any specific user.
As you can see, two additional workloads are provided in zPCR:

- Low-AVG,
- AVG-High.

There are no benchmarks underlying these workloads; the reported values are calculated as a harmonic mean of the base benchmarks.

### Partition Detail Report

Based on LSPR Data for IBM System z Processors
Study ID: UKCMG
z10-EC Host = 2097-E40/700 with 26 CPs: GP = 19zIIP = 7
11 Active Partitions: GP = 7 zIIP = 4
Capacity is based on a 2094-701 assumed at 602.00 MIPS for a 1-partition configuration
System z10 processor capacity for z/OS is represented with HiperDispatch turned ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include</th>
<th>Partition Identification</th>
<th>Partition Configuration</th>
<th>Partition Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GP LP-01 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 8 300 30.00%</td>
<td>3,425 4,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GP LP-02 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 8 300 30.00%</td>
<td>3,425 4,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GP LP-03 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 4 150 15.00%</td>
<td>1,912 2,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GP LP-04 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 4 150 15.00%</td>
<td>1,912 2,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GP LP-05 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 2 30 3.00%</td>
<td>411 1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GP LP-06 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 2 40 4.00%</td>
<td>547 1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GP LP-07 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 2 30 3.00%</td>
<td>411 1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1</td>
<td>zIIP LP-01 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 7 400 40.00%</td>
<td>1,845 4,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2</td>
<td>zIIP LP-02 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 7 400 40.00%</td>
<td>1,845 4,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3</td>
<td>zIIP LP-03 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 2 100 10.00%</td>
<td>489 1,397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4</td>
<td>zIIP LP-04 z/OS-1.9* LoIO-Mix SHR 2 100 10.00%</td>
<td>489 1,397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table View

- All Partitions
- Includes only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Pools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] All Partitions</td>
<td>GP, IFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Includes only</td>
<td>zAAP, ICF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14 presents a study performed using zPCR 6.3c. The Reference CPU is 2094-701, quoted at 602 MIPS. The machine is a 2097-719 with 7 zIIPs. All the workloads are LoIO-Mix running on z/OS 1.9. The total CCP capacity is 12,042 MIPS while zIIP capacity is 4,668 MIPS.
When loading the above study using zPCR 7.1a, we got the following message:

![zPCR Load Study](image)

Answering Yes, we accepted the suggested modifications and we got the result in Figure 16.

### Partition Detail Report

Based on LSFR Data for IBM System z Processors

Study ID: UKCMG

Z10-EC Host = 2097-E40/700 with 26 CPs: GP = 19, zIIP = 7

11 Active Partitions: GP = 7, zIIP = 4

Capacity is based on a 2094-701 assumed at 602.00 MIPS for a 1-partition configuration

System z10 processor for z/OS is represented with HiperDispatch turned ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include</th>
<th>Partition Identification</th>
<th>Partition Configuration</th>
<th>Partition Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>LP-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>zIIP</td>
<td>LP-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>zIIP</td>
<td>LP-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>zIIP</td>
<td>LP-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>zIIP</td>
<td>LP-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display Pools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ All Partitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Includes only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Summary by Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP Pool</th>
<th>RCPs</th>
<th>Partitions</th>
<th>LCPs</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zAAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zIIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Reference CPU is still a 2094-701, but it is now quoted at 593 MIPS. All the workloads are now Average (AVG RNI). The total CCP capacity is 11,804 MIPS while zIIP capacity is 4,566 MIPS.

A last note is related to the usable benchmarks; zPCR 7.1a always uses the z/OS 1.11 benchmarks, no matter what is reported in the SCP column.

8 Conclusions

New benchmarks are provided for z/OS 1.11 and above; they are the only ones available for z196 machines. To allow customers to compare current machines (mostly z9 and z10), with the new ones, these benchmarks have been published for all the existing IBM machines.

Unfortunately, all the capacity planning studies up to now have been performed using completely different benchmarks, so customers will need a “bridge” to the new benchmarks when evaluating an upgrade to z196.

To understand which is the right benchmark to use to estimate your machine capacity, you can follow the IBM guidelines or collect the new measurement provided in SMF 113 type records. We showed how the first option could produce contrasting results and probably increase capacity estimate errors.

Finally, the new zPCR version, (7.1a), is required in order to perform studies involving z196 machines. In addition, special care is needed when loading studies created with older zPCR versions.

Addendum

In this addendum, z196 extended counters will be discussed in detail. Some examples of using MF counters in capacity planning and performance analysis will also be presented.

A.1 CPU Measurement Facility – Counters for z196

As discussed previously, a new cache level (L3), has been introduced in the z196 processor architecture to provide memory shared among all of the processors on a chip.

Unfortunately, this is not the only difference between z10 and z196 extended counters.

Cache levels have been renamed so:

- The second level cache dedicated to each processor, called L1.5 in z10, is now called L2;
- The cache shared among all the processors in a book, called L2 in z10, is now called L4.

Additionally, most of the extended counters fields have been changed\(^\text{11}\) . These are the metrics needed to analyze the ‘sourcing’ of L1 cache from the other cache levels and from memory:

\(^{11}\) only the counters for L2 cache, (L1.5 in z10), are the same.
a) E128, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L2 (data);
b) E129, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L2 (instr.);
c) E150, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L3 (data);
d) E153, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L3 (instr.);
e) E135, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOC L4 (data);
f) E136, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOC L4 (instr.);
g) E152, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L3 THROUGH LOC L4 (data);
h) E155, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L3 THROUGH LOC L4 (instr.);
i) E138, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM REM L4 (data);
j) E139, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM REM L4 (instr.);
k) E134, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L3 THROUGH REM L4 (data);
l) E143, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM L3 THROUGH REM L4 (instr.);
m) E141, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOC MEM (data);
n) E142, L1 MISS SOURCED FROM LOC MEM (instr.).

The counters in **bold** are the ones related to the L3 cache activity. As you can see, E150 and E153 provide the number of times data and instructions have been found in L3 cache.

A bit more strange is the fact that E152 and E155 are included in L4 local cache counters. What happens in this case, is that data and instructions are found in the L3 cache of another chip in the same book. So they have to be moved first to the upper level cache (L4), which is shared among all of the processors in the same book, and then to the L1 cache.

The red arrows in the following figure show the path from L3 to L1.

![Figure 1](image-url)
Similarly, E134 and E143 are included in L4 remote cache counters. What happens in this case, is that data and instructions are found in the L3 cache of another chip in another book. So they have to be moved first to the upper level cache (L4), in the remote book, then to the L4 cache of the local book, and finally to the L1 cache. The red arrows in the following figure show the path from L3 to L1.

![Figure 2](image)

**A.2 Using MF counters**

MF counters can be used to create different indexes to monitor. The most important of them are:

- L1 cache misses (L1M), and Relative Nest Intensity (RNI), to understand what is the right benchmark to use in Capacity Planning to represent each system;
- Cycles per Instructions (CPI), to evaluate cache contention.
L1M and RNI

The following figure presents the L1M and RNI hourly profiles for the SYSA development system running in a z196 machine.

![L1M and RNI Profiles](image)

Based on the prime shift (9-17 hrs) in Figure 3, L1M is less than 3%. Additionally, RNI is always greater than 0.75. Therefore, as seen in Figure 4 below, this particular system will be classified as AVG RNI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% L1 Miss</th>
<th>RNI</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3%</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.75</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>&gt; 1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>0.60 to 1.00</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.60</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6%</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.75</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![RNI Classification](image)

It’s also interesting to take a look at the effectiveness of each cache level. The following graph in Figure 5 shows the effect of the L3 cache (reported in light green). Only one book is used, so no activity is reported from the remote L4 cache.
Figure 6 presents the L1M and RNI hourly profiles for two production systems running in a z10 machine.
Based on the LSPR rules, reported in the following table, the system could be classified as AVG RNI. However in some hours, the RNI values are above 1, so the system could also be classified as HIGH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% L1 Miss</th>
<th>RNI</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3%</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.75</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>&gt; 1.00</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>0.60 to 1.00</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% to 6%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.60</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6%</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.75</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6%</td>
<td>&lt; 0.75</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7

Looking at the overall machine utilization we realized the machine is saturated in many hours of the day, so both L1M and RNI tend to be inflated.

The effectiveness of each cache level can be analyzed in the following graph (Figure 8). This is a multi-book machine but thanks to HiperDispatch, sourcing from remote book caches (L2R), is almost zero. About 20% of the L1 misses are sourced from the local book cache (L2L). Moving part of this activity to z196 would be satisfied by the chip cache, thus improving performance.

Figure 8
CPI

The following figure presents the CPI hourly profile for the SYSA development system.

Figure 9

Maximum values are around 5, but after 9 am they are between 2 and 3. Looking at the SYS1 and SYS2 production systems we get a completely different picture.

Figure 10

Values are around 6, but as soon as the machine become saturated they peak up to 10.
As you can imagine, there is not a Rule of Thumb for the ideal CPI value. However it’s intuitive that to exploit the processor power, the CPI should be as low as possible. In this case an upgrade will greatly reduce the SYS1 and SYS2 CPI in the peak hours.

Measuring this index on a regular basis will allow you to evaluate the effect of changes in:

- Hardware configuration;
- Microcode;
- Exploitation of HiperDispatch;
- LPAR configuration such as weights, number of logical processors, number of LPARs, etc.;
- System and subsystem levels (e.g. DB2 V10 will take advantage of a new HW instruction to prefetch data and instructions);
- Workload mixture.

Using this knowledge you will be able, in case of performance degradation after a change, to quickly identify the problem and solve it.