Concurrent Systems

Nebenläufige Systeme

XIII. Progress Guarantee

Wolfgang Schröder-Preikschat

— Selbststudium —

Agenda

In a Nutshell

Outline

In a Nutshell

Process Synchronisation

- necessary characteristics of a synchronisation protocol for a reference system of a specific number of concurrent processes:
  - i *the solution must be* ***symmetrical*** *between the processes; as a result we are not allowed to introduce a static priority*
  - ii *nothing may be assumed about the* ***relative speeds*** *of the processes; we may not even assume their speeds to be constant in time*
  - iii *if any of the processes is stopped well outside its critical section, this is not allowed to potential* ***blocking*** *of the others*
  - iv *if more than one process is about to enter its critical section, it must be impossible to derive for them such finite speeds, that the decision to determine which one of them will enter its critical section first is postponed until* ***eternity***

Process Synchronisation

acc. [1] or [2, p. 121], resp.

- necessary characteristics of a synchronisation protocol for a reference system of a specific number of concurrent processes:
  - i *the solution must be **symmetrical** between the processes; as a result we are not allowed to introduce a static priority*
  - ii *nothing may be assumed about the **relative speeds** of the processes; we may not even assume their speeds to be constant in time*
  - iii *if any of the processes is stopped well outside its critical section, this is not allowed to potential **blocking** of the others*
  - iv *if more than one process is about to enter its critical section, it must be impossible to derive for them such finite speeds, that the decision to determine which one of them will enter its critical section first is postponed until **eternity***
- although originally based on mutual exclusion of those processes, the characteristics hold for non-blocking synchronisation as well

Liveness Properties

- characteristics of algorithms for **non-blocking synchronisation**

Liveness Properties

- characteristics of algorithms for **non-blocking synchronisation**:

obstruction-free
- if any process eventually in isolation (i.e., absence of simultaneously interacting processes) can complete any operation in a finite number of steps [4]
- prone to **starvation** of conflicting processes

Liveness Properties

- characteristics of algorithms for **non-blocking synchronisation**:

lock-free
- if "some process will complete an operation in a finite number of steps, regardless of the relative speeds of the processes" [3, p. 142][1]
- free of **starvation** of at least one conflicting process

[1] Originally, also referred to as "non-blocking".

Liveness Properties

- characteristics of algorithms for **non-blocking synchronisation**:

wait-free
- if “any process can complete any operation in a finite number of steps, regardless of the relative speeds of the other processes” [3, p. 7]
- free of starvation of any conflicting process

Liveness Properties

- characteristics of algorithms for **non-blocking synchronisation**:

  obstruction-free
  - if any process eventually in isolation (i.e., absence of simultaneously interacting processes) can complete any operation in a finite number of steps [4]
  - prone to **starvation** of conflicting processes

  lock-free
  - if "some process will complete an operation in a finite number of steps, regardless of the relative speeds of the processes" [3, p. 142][1]
  - free of **starvation** of at least one conflicting process

  wait-free
  - if "any process can complete any operation in a finite number of steps, regardless of the relative speeds of the other processes" [3, p. 7]
  - free of starvation of any conflicting process
- all, no process can be blocked by delays or failures of other processes
  - that is to say, any of these procedures ensures **deadlock freedom**

[1] Originally, also referred to as "non-blocking".

Transactional Computation I

```
word_t any;                          /* shared data */
{
    word_t old, new;                 /* own data */
    do new = compute(old = any);     /* read */
    while (!CAS(&any, old, new));    /* validate/write */
}
```

Transactional Computation I

```
word_t any;                            /* shared data */
{
    word_t old, new;                   /* own data */
    do new = compute(old = any);       /* read */
    while (!CAS(&any, old, new));      /* validate/write */
}
```

- at a first glance, this looks like lock-free progress guarantee:
  - CAS ensures that one out of possibly many conflicting processes succeeds
  - yet, which one is not determined and process overhauling[2] is facilitated

[2] A desirable property given priority-based process scheduling.

Transactional Computation I

```
word_t any;                              /* shared data */
{
    word_t old, new;                     /* own data */
    do new = compute(old = any);         /* read */
    while (!CAS(&any, old, new));        /* validate/write */
}
```

- at a first glance, this looks like lock-free progress guarantee:
  - CAS ensures that one out of possibly many conflicting processes succeeds
  - yet, which one is not determined and process overhauling[2] is facilitated
- however, a closer look may even reveal only obstruction freedom:
  - progress guarantee stands and falls with the properties of *compute*

    stands – lock-free if *compute* is either lock- or wait-free

    falls – off to obstruction-free if *compute* is obstruction-free
  - thus, the likewise weaker property of *compute* comes out on top

[2] A desirable property given priority-based process scheduling.

Transactional Computation I


```
word_t any;                             /* shared data */
{
    word_t old, new;                    /* own data */
    do new = compute(old = any);        /* read */
    while (!CAS(&any, old, new));       /* validate/write */
}
```

- at a first glance, this looks like lock-free progress guarantee:
  - CAS ensures that one out of possibly many conflicting processes succeeds
  - yet, which one is not determined and process overhauling[2] is facilitated
- however, a closer look may even reveal only obstruction freedom:
  - progress guarantee stands and falls with the properties of *compute*

    stands – lock-free if *compute* is either lock- or wait-free

    falls – off to obstruction-free if *compute* is obstruction-free
  - thus, the likewise weaker property of *compute* comes out on top
- strengthening of the progress guarantee at a higher level is illusionary
  - without willingness to break abstraction or black-box reuse, resp., down

[2] A desirable property given priority-based process scheduling.

Transactional Computation II

```
word_t any;                              /* shared data */
{
    word_t new;                          /* own data */
    do new = compute(LL(&any));          /* read */
    while (!SC(&any, new));              /* validate/write */
}
```

Transactional Computation II

```
word_t any;                             /* shared data */
{
    word_t new;                         /* own data */
    do new = compute(LL(&any));         /* read */
    while (!SC(&any, new));             /* validate/write */
}
```

- at a first glance, the progress guarantee is the same as before (p. 6):
  - SC ensures that one out of possibly many conflicting processes succeeds
  - also, the likewise weaker property of *compute* comes out on top

Transactional Computation II

```
word_t any;                              /* shared data */
{
    word_t new;                          /* own data */
    do new = compute(LL(&any));          /* read */
    while (!SC(&any, new));              /* validate/write */
}
```

- at a first glance, the progress guarantee is the same as before (p. 6):
  - SC ensures that one out of possibly many conflicting processes succeeds
  - also, the likewise weaker property of *compute* comes out on top
- however, a closer look may even reveal a further dependency:

LL
- besides reading from memory, typically performs two actions:
  - i make a reservation for a hardware-dependent address range
  - ii as the case may be, remember the effective address of the location

SC
- if a reservation exists, overwrite the addressed location
  - – if applicable, only if the applied address matches the remembered one
- in any case, cancel a possibly existing reservation

Transactional Computation II


```
word_t any;                                 /* shared data */
{
    word_t new;                             /* own data */
    do new = compute(LL(&any));             /* read */
    while (!SC(&any, new));                 /* validate/write */
}
```

- at a first glance, the progress guarantee is the same as before (p. 6):
  - SC ensures that one out of possibly many conflicting processes succeeds
  - also, the likewise weaker property of *compute* comes out on top
- however, a closer look may even reveal a further dependency:
  - LL
    - besides reading from memory, typically performs two actions:
      - i make a reservation for a hardware-dependent address range
      - ii as the case may be, remember the effective address of the location
  - SC
    - if a reservation exists, overwrite the addressed location
      - – if applicable, only if the applied address matches the remembered one
    - in any case, cancel a possibly existing reservation
- plain sequences of LL/SC may be obstruction-free, only (cf. p. 13)
  - **exceptions** (i.e., traps/interrupts) may or may not cancel reservations
  - similar may hold for specific (“manually ejected”) memory operations

Table-Based Scheduling I

- bear in mind that each process also acts as a "***feeder***" of a CPU core
  - normally, a process releases its processor either voluntarily or involuntarily
  - it either blocks or yields, or it gets the processor revoked (preemption)

Table-Based Scheduling I

- bear in mind that each process also acts as a "***feeder***" of a CPU core
  - normally, a process releases its processor either voluntarily or involuntarily
  - it either blocks or yields, or it gets the processor revoked (preemption)
- each feeder takes the scheduling decision in a finite number of steps:

```
process_t *elect(hoard_t *vain) {
    process_t *next;

    for (next = being(0); next < being(NPROC); next++) {
        if (next->state != READY)
            continue;

        if (CAS(&next->state, READY, READY | PENDING))
            return next;
    }

    return 0;
}
```

Table-Based Scheduling I

- bear in mind that each process also acts as a "***feeder***" of a CPU core
  - normally, a process releases its processor either voluntarily or involuntarily
  - it either blocks or yields, or it gets the processor revoked (preemption)
- each feeder takes the scheduling decision in a finite number of steps:

```
process_t *elect(hoard_t *vain) {
    process_t *next;

    for (next = being(0); next < being(NPROC); next++) {
        if (next->state != READY)
            continue;

        if (CAS(&next->state, READY, READY | PENDING))
            return next;
    }

    return 0;
}
```

  - the scheduling loop is **bounded** by the number of process descriptors

Table-Based Scheduling II

```c
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    while ((next = uncage(&this->wait))) {
        next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
        next->state = READY;
        done += 1;
    }

    return done;
}
```

uncage
- attempt to *purge* a chain item from the queue-based per-event waitlist $\leadsto$ lock-free semantics in case of [5, p. 30]
- if succeeded, coerce the pointer to the purged chain item into the pointer to the enclosing process descriptor (cf. p. 14)

Table-Based Scheduling II

```
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    while ((next = uncage(&this->wait))) {
        next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
        next->state = READY;
        done += 1;
    }

    return done;
}
```

uncage
- attempt to *purge* a chain item from the queue-based per-event waitlist ⇝ lock-free semantics in case of [5, p. 30]
- if succeeded, coerce the pointer to the purged chain item into the pointer to the enclosing process descriptor (cf. p. 14)

- even in case of a wait-free *purge*, the schedule loop is **unbounded**

Table-Based Scheduling II


```
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    while ((next = uncage(&this->wait))) {
        next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
        next->state = READY;
        done += 1;
    }

    return done;
}
```

uncage
- attempt to *purge* a chain item from the queue-based per-event waitlist ⇝ lock-free semantics in case of [5, p. 30]
- if succeeded, coerce the pointer to the purged chain item into the pointer to the enclosing process descriptor (cf. p. 14)

- even in case of a wait-free *purge*, the schedule loop is **unbounded**
  - a former uncaged process may have been dispatched in the meantime
  - ↪ assume that the process blocks on the same event while signalling (*cause*)

Table-Based Scheduling III


```
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    while ((done < N) && (next = uncage(&this->wait))) {
        next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
        next->state = READY;
        done += 1;
    }

    return done;
}
```

- a WCET[3] of the schedule loop is given only with a wait-free *purge*
  - in that case: $WCET(loop) \leq N \times WCET(purge)$, thus bounded

[3] *worst-case execution time*

Table-Based Scheduling III


```
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    while ((done < N) && (next = uncage(&this->wait))) {
        next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
        next->state = READY;
        done += 1;
    }

    return done;
}
```

- a WCET[3] of the schedule loop is given only with a wait-free *purge*
  - in that case: $WCET(loop) \leq N \times WCET(purge)$, thus bounded
- but in case of a lock-free *purge*, the schedule loop is lock-free also
  - a lock-free *purge* implies a **possibly unbounded** latency until returning

[3] *worst-case execution time*

Table-Based Scheduling III


```
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    while ((done < N) && (next = uncage(&this->wait))) {
        next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
        next->state = READY;
        done += 1;
    }

    return done;
}
```

- a WCET[3] of the schedule loop is given only with a wait-free *purge*
  - in that case: $\mathit{WCET}(\mathit{loop}) \leq N \times \mathit{WCET}(\mathit{purge})$, thus bounded
- but in case of a lock-free *purge*, the schedule loop is lock-free also
  - a lock-free *purge* implies a **possibly unbounded** latency until returning
- last but not least, similar holds in case of an obstruction-free *purge*. . .

[3] *worst-case execution time*

Table-Based Scheduling IV

- each signaller takes the scheduling decision in a finite number of steps

```
int cause(event_t *this) {
    process_t *next;
    int done = 0;

    for (next = being(0); next < being(NPROC); next++) {
        if (next->event != this)
            continue;

        if (CAS(&next->event, this, 0)) {
            next->merit = being(ONESELF)->name;
            next->state = READY;
            done += 1;
        }
    }

    return done;
}
```

- the scheduling loop is **bounded** by the number of process descriptors

Reference List I

[1] Dijkstra, E. W.:
Solution of a Problem in Concurrent Programming Control.
In: *Communications of the ACM* 8 (1965), Sept., Nr. 9, S. 569

[2] Dijkstra, E. W.:
Hierarchical Ordering of Sequential Processes.
In: *Acta Informatica* 1 (1971), S. 115–138

[3] Herlihy, M. :
Wait-Free Synchronization.
In: *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 11 (1991), Jan., Nr. 1, S. 124–149

[4] Herlihy, M. ; Luchangco, V. ; Moir, M. :
Obstruction-Free Synchronization: Double-Ended Queues as an Example.
In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS 2003), May 19–22, 2003, Providence, Rhode Island, USA*, IEEE Computer Society, 2003, S. 522–529

[5] Schröder-Preikschat, W. :
Non-Blocking Synchronisation.
In: Lehrstuhl Informatik 4 (Hrsg.): *Concurrent Systems.*
FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg, 2014 (Lecture Slides), Kapitel 11

LL/SC Shallows

Alpha
- if the effective addresses are not within the same naturally aligned 16-byte section, the sequence may fail or succeed
- a reservation on a particular processor can be arbitrarily canceled by unspecified events on another processor
- if any other memory access is executed on the given processor in between, the sequence may always fail on some implementations
- a timer interrupt always cancels an existing reservation

MIPS
- a load, store, or prefetch event executed on the issuing processor may cause the sequence to fail or succeed
- the largest cache line in use determines the reservation granularity

PPC6
- the reservation granularity is implementation-dependent
- exceptions (traps/interrupts) hold up an existing reservation
- a conditional store to a "scratch" address cancels the reservation

PPC8
- ditto, but the processor grants stores only to the reserved address

If a reservation endures exceptional situations and the processor does not compare with the reservation address, the operating system must cancel the reservation in those cases.

Process-Type Coercion

```
inline void *coerce(void *ptr, int val) {
  return (void *)((unsigned)ptr - val);
}

inline process_t *uncage(waitlist_h *list) {
  chain_t *item = purge_lfs((queue_t *)list);

  if (item)
    item = coerce(item, (int)&((process_t *)0)->event);

  return (process_t *)item;
}
```