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Linux Kernel and Weak Ordering

- **Split counters**
  - Each CPU increments its own counter to update, occasional statistical readout sums all CPUs' counters: No ordering required

- **Memory allocator**
  - Fastpath has neither atomic instructions or memory barriers
  - However, there are kfree()-to-kmalloc() requirements across CPUs

- **RCU**
  - More on this in the following slides...
Linux Kernel and Weak Ordering

- Split counters
  - Each CPU increments its own counter to update, occasional statistical readout sums all CPUs' counters: No ordering required

- Memory allocator
  - Fastpath has neither atomic instructions or memory barriers
  - However, there are kfree()-to-kmalloc() requirements across CPUs

- RCU
  - More on this in the following slides...

- Lots of opportunity for reordering in the Linux kernel!!!
What Is RCU?
Why RCU?

- To accommodate the laws of physics
  - And other trivial issues...
Speed of Light (to Say Nothing of Electrons) is Finite; Size of Computers is Non-Zero

Upcoming CPU Chip

Diagonally across chip and back (35.8mm):
- 3.6 clocks at 1GHz
- 17.9 clocks at 5GHz

Out for the request, back to return the data

Problem With Physics #1: Finite Speed of Light
Problem With Physics #2: Atomic Nature of Matter

Source

No complaints for eons, and now, suddenly, we’re too $%^& big?!

I feel so fat!

Base

Base

Drain

And our dielectric constant isn’t big enough for them! They can go find some other $%^& atom! Sheesh!
Performance of Synchronization Mechanisms

16-CPU 2.8GHz Intel X5550 (Nehalem) System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Cost (ns)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clock period</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Best-case” CAS</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-case lock</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cache miss</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS cache miss</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cache miss (off-core)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS cache miss (off-core)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cache miss (off-socket)</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>256.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS cache miss (off-socket)</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>266.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That 3.6 and 17.9 clocks now looks pretty good...
Buffering, queueing and caching result in substantial additional performance degradation!
But What Do The Operation Timings Really Mean???

- Single instruction protected by *contended* lock

  - 256.7 cycles
  - 1 cycle

Uncontended

Contended, No Spinning

Contended, Spinning

258.7 CPUs breaks even w/single CPU!

514.4 CPUs breaks even w/single CPU!!!

Arbitrarily large number of CPUs to break even with single CPU!!
Not so good for real-time!!!
Also Applies to Reader-Writer Locking, Non-Blocking Synchronization and Transactional Memory

Though read-only transactions can be heavily optimized, but not as heavily as RCU can.
Can't Hardware Do Better Than This???

- There might be some ways to improve hardware:
  - 3D lithography: Too bad about power and heat dissipation!
  - Extreme ultraviolet lithography: Making progress, but limited
  - Liquid immersion lithography: Making progress, but limited
  - Asynchronous logic: Big in the '60s, starting to be used again
  - Exotic materials (e.g., graphene): Promising, but still a research toy
  - Light rather than electrons: Promising, but still a research toy
  - Vacuum-channel transistors: Promising, but still a research toy
  - **Wormholes:** Works great on Star Trek!!!
  - **Hyperspace:** Works great on Star Wars!!!

- Although hardware will continue to improve, software needs to do its part: “Free lunch” exponential performance improvement of 80s and 90s is over
How Can Software Live With This Hardware???
Two Basic Ways To Proceed...

1: Reduce synchronization overhead
2: Increase critical section duration

We will focus on option #1, for readers. (In real life, you need to do both.)
### Design Principle: Avoid Expensive Operations

#### 16-CPU 2.8GHz Intel X5550 (Nehalem) System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Cost (ns)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clock period</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Best-case” CAS</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-case lock</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cache miss</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS cache miss</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cache miss (off-core)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS cache miss (off-core)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cache miss (off-socket)</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>256.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS cache miss (off-socket)</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>266.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use cheap-and-cheerful operations
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Taking It To The Limit...

“Only those who have gone too far can possibly tell you how far you can go!!!”
Taking It To The Limit...

- Lightest-weight conceivable read-side primitives
  - /* Assume non-preemptible (run-to-block) environment. */
  - #define rcu_read_lock()
  - #define rcu_read_unlock()

- Best possible performance, scalability, real-time response, wait-freedom, and energy efficiency
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- Lightest-weight conceivable read-side primitives
  - /* Assume non-preemptible (run-to-block) environment. */
  - #define rcu_read_lock()
  - #define rcu_read_unlock()

- Best possible performance, scalability, real-time response, wait-freedom, and energy efficiency

- But how can a primitive that doesn't affect machine state possibly be a useful synchronization primitive?
Publication of And Subscription to New Data

Key:
- Red: Dangerous for updates: all readers can access
- Yellow: Still dangerous for updates: pre-existing readers can access (next slide)
- Green: Safe for updates: inaccessible to all readers

But if all we do is add, we have a big memory leak!!!
RCU Removal From Linked List

- Combines waiting for readers and multiple versions:
  - Writer removes element B from the list (list_del_rcu())
  - Writer waits for all readers to finish (synchronize_rcu())
  - Writer can then free element B (kfree())

But if readers leave no trace in memory, how can we possibly tell when they are done???
How Can RCU Tell When Readers Are Done???

That is, without re-introducing all of the overhead and latency inherent to other synchronization mechanisms...
Waiting for Pre-Existing Readers: QSBR

- Non-preemptive environment (CONFIG_PREEMPT=n)
  - Tasks holding pure spinlocks are not allowed to block due to deadlock issues
  - Same rule for RCU readers, which are also not permitted to block
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- CPU context switch means all that CPU's prior readers are done

- Grace period ends after all CPUs execute a context switch
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- Non-preemptive environment (CONFIG_PREEMPT=n)
  - Tasks holding pure spinlocks are not allowed to block due to deadlock issues
  - Same rule for RCU readers, which are also not permitted to block

- CPU context switch means all that CPU's prior readers are done

- *Grace period* ends after all CPUs execute a context switch
The Unanswered Question

- But how can a primitive that doesn't affect machine state possibly be a useful synchronization primitive?
The Unanswered Question

- But how can a primitive that doesn't affect machine state possibly be a useful synchronization primitive?
  - The developer must not place synchronize_rcu() within an RCU read-side critical section
  - RCU synchronizes not via machine state, but rather the developer
The Unanswered Question

- But how can a primitive that doesn't affect machine state possibly be a useful synchronization primitive?
  - The developer must not place synchronize_rcu() within an RCU read-side critical section
  - RCU synchronizes not via machine state, but rather the developer
  - RCU achieves synchronization via social engineering!
Toy Implementation of RCU: 20 Lines of Code

- **Read-side primitives:**
  ```c
  #define rcu_read_lock()
  #define rcu_read_unlock()
  #define rcu_dereference(p)  
  ({ 
      typeof(p) _p1 = (*(volatile typeof(p))*&(p)); 
      smp_read_barrier_depends(); 
      _p1; 
  })
  ```

- **Update-side primitives**
  ```c
  #define rcu_assign_pointer(p, v)  
  ({ 
      smp_wmb(); 
      ACCESS_ONCE(p) = (v); 
  })
  ```

```c
void synchronize_rcu(void)
{
    int cpu;

    for_each_online_cpu(cpu)
        run_on(cpu);
}
```
void synchronize_rcu(void) 
{
    int cpu;
    for_each_online_cpu(cpu)
        run_on(cpu);
}
Adding CPUs makes SELinux slower!!!
Linux Kernel write() System Call: SELinux (RCU)

RCU provides linear scalability *and* order-of-magnitude improvements
RCU Area of Applicability

- **Read-Mostly, Stale & Inconsistent Data OK** *(RCU Works Great!!!)*
- **Read-Mostly, Need Consistent Data** *(RCU Works OK)*
- **Read-Write, Need Consistent Data** *(RCU Might Be OK...)*
- **Update-Mostly, Need Consistent Data** *(RCU is Unlikely to be the Right Tool For The Job, But It Can:
  1. Provide Existence Guarantees For Update-Friendly Mechanisms
  2. Provide Wait-Free Read-Side Primitives for Real-Time Use)*
RCU Applicability to the Linux Kernel

![Graph showing the increase in RCU API uses from 2002 to 2016. The number of RCU API uses increases sharply from 2012 onwards.](image-url)
RCU Applicability to the Linux Kernel

Which is great – but how are we validating all this???
To Probe Further Into RCU:

- https://queue.acm.org/detail.cfm?id=2488549
  - “Structured Deferral: Synchronization via Procrastination” (also in July 2013 CACM)
  - “User-Level Implementations of Read-Copy Update”
- git://lttng.org/userspace-rcu.git (User-space RCU git tree)
  - Applying RCU and weighted-balance tree to Linux mmap_sem.
  - RCU-protected resizable hash tables, both in kernel and user space
  - Combining RCU and software transactional memory
- http://wiki.cs.pdx.edu/rp/: Relativistic programming, a generalization of RCU
- http://lwn.net/Articles/262464/, http://lwn.net/Articles/263130/, http://lwn.net/Articles/264090/
  - “What is RCU?” Series
  - RCU motivation, implementations, usage patterns, performance (micro+sys)
  - System-level performance for SELinux workload: >500x improvement
  - Comparison of RCU and NBS (later appeared in JPDC)
- http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1400097.1400099
  - History of RCU in Linux (Linux changed RCU more than vice versa)
  - Harvard University class notes on RCU (Courtesy of Eddie Koher)
Linux Kernel Validation: A Grand Challenge
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- Suppose that there is an RCU bug that occurs on average once every million years of execution time
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Linux Kernel Validation: A Grand Challenge

- Suppose that there is an RCU bug that occurs on average once every million years of execution time
- There are now more than one billion Linux kernel instances
- Therefore this bug is exercised about three times per day across the installed base!!!
Limits to Test-Based Validation

Hooray! I passed the stress test!

Ha. You just got lucky.
Linux Kernel Validation State of the Art & Mitigations
Linux Kernel Validation Mitigations

- Why are we getting reasonable reliability on 1G instances???
  - At >15M lines of code, there **are** bugs
  - Million-year bugs happen about **three times per day**
  - And some bugs do get through
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- Why are we getting reasonable reliability on 1G instances???
  - At >15M lines of code, there are bugs
  - Million-year bugs happen about three times per day
  - And some bugs do get through

- The bulk of Linux's installed base has few CPUs
  - Many SMP bugs found and fixed on larger server systems
  - But the CPU counts of “small” embedded systems increasing

- The bulk of Linux's installed base has predictable workload
  - System testing can find most of the relevant bugs
  - But smartphones are becoming general-purpose systems, which will render system testing less effective

- Fortunately lots of validation: testing and tooling!!!
Linux Kernel Validation Overview

- Code review: 10,000 eyes
  - Not that review has kept pace with change rate and complexity!
  - From v3.11 to v3.12:
    - 8636 files changed, 587981 insertions(+), 264385 deletions(-)

- Unit/Stress tests
  - rcutorture, locktest, kernbench, hackbench, ...
  - Linux Test Project, Dave Jones's Trinity (quite effective lately)

- Automated/recurring testing
  - Stephen Rothwell's -next testing
  - Fengguang Wu's kbuild test robot (see next slide)
  - Frequent testing from many individuals and organizations

- Tools: sparse, lockdep, coccinelle, smatch, ...

- A big “Thank You!!!” to everyone helping with this!!!
Future Validation Needs: RCU Anecdotes

- As with airplane safety, you need to look beyond bugs in use:
  - “Near misses” caught by distro testing
    - Recent day-1 RCU CPU stall warning bug (Michal Hocko &c)
    - Shortcoming in my development methods: I need to take diagnostic code more seriously
  - “Near misses” caught by mainline testing
    - Mid-2011 v3.0-rc7 RCU/interrupt/scheduler race
    - RCU is becoming more intertwined with the rest of the kernel: I need to work to increase the isolation between RCU and the rest of the kernel
  - “Near misses” caught by my testing
    - Late 2012 day-1 RCU initialization race
    - See next slide...

- That said, in RCU “day 1” is a slippery concept
  - Three categories of statements in RCU remain from v2.6.12
Late 2012 “Day-1” RCU initialization Race

1. CPU 0 completes grace period, starts new one, cleaning up and initializing up through first leaf rcu_node structure
2. CPU 1 passes through quiescent state (new grace period!)
3. CPU 1 does rcu_read_lock() and acquires reference to A
4. CPU 16 exits dyntick-idle mode (back on old grace period)
5. CPU 16 removes A, passes it to call_rcu()
6. CPU 16 becomes associates callback with next grace period
7. CPU 0 completes cleanup/initialization of rcu_node structures
8. CPU 16 associates callback with now-current grace period
9. All remaining CPUs pass through quiescent states
10. Last CPU performs cleanup on all rcu_node structures
11. CPU 16 notices end of grace period, advances callback to “done” state
12. CPU 16 invokes callback, freeing A (too bad CPU 1 is still using it)

RCU reviewers are smart, but I cannot expect them to find this.
Linux Kernel Validation: Future Possibilities
Validation Via Model Checking

- Formal methods sometimes used by practitioners:
  - QRCU: http://lwn.net/Articles/243851/
  - dyntick-idle: http://lwn.net/Articles/279077/
  - Userspace RCU:
    http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/TPDS.2011.159
  - NO_HZ_FULL_SYSIDLE also validated via Promela (twice!)

- However, going from C to Promela not free of pitfalls
  - Converting C to Promela on each release does not scale!
  - Verifies design, yes, but useless for regression testing

- And the need to use formal methods is often an indication that some simpler method will soon be available
Validation Via Model Checking

- Researchers' traditional focus:
  - Full validation of all behaviors of the system
    - Too bad a description of all behaviors can be as big as the system itself
  - Strong ordering
    - Too bad that all modern systems are weakly ordered, even x86
  - Special-purpose languages (e.g., Promela/spin)
    - Too bad that most parallel code is in general-purpose languages like C/C++

- Richard Bornat, 2011:
  - Our job is to validate the code developers write, in the environment they write it in, and in the language that they write it.

- A number of researchers have been taking this to heart
  - Peter Sewell, Susmit Sarkar, Jade Alglave, Daniel Kroening, Michael Tautschnig, Alexey Gotsman, Noam Riznetsky, Hongseok Yang, ...
Concurrency and Validation: Sewell & Sarkar's Group

- **Formalization of weak-memory models (x86, Power, ARM)**
  - [http://lwn.net/Articles/470681/](http://lwn.net/Articles/470681/)

- **Tools for full state-space search of concurrent code**

```plaintext
PPC IRIW.litmus
"
(* Traditional IRIW. *)
{
0:r1=1; 0:r2=x;
1:r1=1; 1:r4=y;
2: 2:r2=x; 2:r4=y;
3: 3:r2=x; 3:r4=y;
}
P0  P1  P2  P3
| stw r1,0(r2) | stw r1,0(r4) | lwz r3,0(r2) | lwz r3,0(r4) |
| syn | | sync | |
| | | | |
exists
(2:r3=1 \ 2:r5=0 \ 3:r3=1 \ 3:r5=0)
```
Concurrency and Validation: Sewell & Sarkar's Group

- Extremely valuable tool
  - Semi-definitive answers for atomic operations and memory barriers
  - Explores every state that a real system could possibly enter
  - Near production quality

- Some shortcomings:
  - Need to translate code to assembly language
  - Does not handle arbitrary loops or arrays
  - Only handles very small code sequences
  - Applies to Power, ARM, C/C++11, but not generic Linux barriers
  - ~14 CPU-hours and ~10GB to validate example, 3.3MB of output
    - Failures detected more quickly
    - Omitting sync instructions detects failure in less than three CPU minutes
    - And knowing in 14 hours is better than just not knowing!

- Important milestone in handling real-world parallelism
Validation Via Model Checking: Alglave, Kroening, and Tautschnig

- Programming languages might be Turing complete, but you can get a long way with finite state machines: Any real system is FSM

- Finite state machines represented by logic expressions
  - Assertions can be tested with boolean satisfiability tester (SAT)
  - Memory model captured (partially) as additional constraints

- SAT is NP complete
  - But full state-space searches are no picnic, either
  - And much progress on SAT: million-variable problems now feasible

- Easily scripted:

```bash
#!/bin/sh
goto-cc -o $1.goto $1.c
goto-instrument --wmm power $1.goto $1_power.goto
nthreads=`grep __CPROVER_ASYNC_ $1.c | wc -l`
nthreads=`expr $nthreads + 1`
satabs --concurrency --full-inlining --max-threads $nthreads $1_power.goto
```
Multithreaded Model Checking: IRIW Example Input

```c
int __unbuffered_cnt=0;
int __unbuffered_p0_EAX=0;
int __unbuffered_p0_EDX=0;
int __unbuffered_p1_EAX=0;
int __unbuffered_p1_EDX=0;
int x=0;
int y=0;

void * P0(void * arg) {
    __unbuffered_p0_EAX = x;
    asm("sync ");
    __unbuffered_p0_EDX = y;
    // Instrumentation for CPROVER
    asm("sync ");
    __unbuffered_cnt++;
}

void * P2(void * arg) {
    x = 1;
    // Instrumentation for CPROVER
    asm("sync ");
    __unbuffered_cnt++;
}

void * P3(void * arg) {
    y = 1;
    // Instrumentation for CPROVER
    asm("sync ");
    __unbuffered_cnt++;
}
```
int main() {
    __CPROVER_ASYNC_0: P0(0);
    __CPROVER_ASYNC_1: P1(0);
    __CPROVER_ASYNC_2: P2(0);
    __CPROVER_ASYNC_3: P3(0);
    __CPROVER_assume(__unbuffered_cnt==4);
    assert(__unbuffered_p0_EAX==0 || __unbuffered_p0_EDX == 1 ||
           __unbuffered_p1_EAX==0 || __unbuffered_p1_EDX == 1);
    return 0;
}
Multithreaded Model Checking: IRIW Example Output

Statistics of refiner:
Invalid states requiring more than 1 passive thread: 2
Spurious assignment transitions requiring more than 1 passive thread: 0
Spurious guard transitions requiring more than 1 passive thread: 0
Total transition refinements: 48
Transition refinement iterations: 10

VERIFICATION SUCCESSFUL

Same result as cppmem, but much faster: 2.61 CPU seconds vs ~14 CPU hours
Omitting sync instructions slows down to 134 CPU seconds: larger expressions
But They Were Not Satisfied With This...
But They Were Not Satisfied With This...

“Herding cats: Modelling, simulation, testing, and data-mining for weak memory”
Alglave, Maranget, and Tautschnig, to appear in TOPLAS.
IRIW According to the “herd” Tool

... 

2:r3=1; 2:r5=1; 3:r3=1; 3:r5=0;
2:r3=1; 2:r5=1; 3:r3=1; 3:r5=1;
No
Witnesses
Positive: 0 Negative: 15
Condition exists (2:r3=1 /\ 2:r5=0 /\ 3:r3=1 /\ 3:r5=0)
Observation IRIW Never 0 15
Hash=41423414f4e33c57cc1c9f17cd585c4d

Same result as cppmem and goto-cc/goto-instrument/satabs, but even faster: 16 **milliseconds** (vs. 2.61 CPU sec for goto... and ~14 CPU hours for ppcmem)
You omitted the sync instructions? Still 16 milliseconds to validate failure!

Two orders of magnitude improvement over goto..., and **six** orders of magnitude Improvement over ppcmem. So maybe the axiomatic approach is even better use of SAT solvers! :-}
Tantalizing Possibilities

- Might I add comments to Linux-kernel RCU marking sections of code that can be formally verified?
  - Rerun the verification on each release
  - Or even as part of each testing cycle

- What is needed to make this happen?
  - Much better idea of the scope of the SAT-based and axiomatic formal verification approaches
  - Increased reliability of the formal verification software
  - Scaffolding and assertions to be automatically incorporated
    - Hopefully this can be a small matter of scripting
Summary

- Linux kernel makes heavy use of weak ordering
  - Split counters, memory allocators, RCU, …

- Linux-kernel validation grand challenge:
  - One billion instances: Million-year bugs happening three times per day!

- Substantive validation technology:
  - Per-commit build/boot/test, lock dependency checking, static analysis, stress testing, occasional use of formal verification

- Important mitigation factors:
  - Extensive testing on 4096 CPUs, real-time use, most of installed base having few CPUs, …

- But more is needed: Will I be able to add powerful formal verification methods to my RCU validation suite?
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