GPS:

Navigating weak memory with *ghosts*, *protocols*, and *separation*



Aaron Turon Viktor Vafeiadis Derek Dreyer MPI-SWS

GPS: To appear in OOPSLA' 14 (don't shoot me)

Navigating weak memory with *ghosts*, *protocols*, and *separation*



Aaron Turon Viktor Vafeiadis Derek Dreyer MPI-SWS



Concurrent Program Logics

Separation Logic, 2001



Concurrent Program Logics





CaReSL's "protocols" [Turon et al. 2013] concisely characterize the dynamically evolving interference on some piece of shared state.



The Problem

All these logics assume:

- unrestricted data races
- sequential consistency (SC)

This is not a realistic model of concurrency for high-performance algorithms!





print y print x

print y print x



print y print x

print y print x $\rightarrow 2 0$



print y print x $\rightarrow 20$

print y print x $\rightarrow 20$



print y print x $\rightarrow 20$

Unsound!

print y print x $\rightarrow 2 0$



Option #1: Prohibit data races

Makes sense for most code
 Validates seq. optimizations
 Doesn't help if we want to be racy for high performance

x := 1 \parallel print yy := 2 \parallel print xx := 3 \checkmark 20

Option #2: Allow data races for certain variables

- Good for hi-perf concurrent algorithms
- SC semantics is too expensive to implement on modern hardware (must add fences)

x := 1||print yy := 2||print xx := 3|| \rightarrow 2 0

 Option #2: Allow data races for certain variables
 Good for hi-perf concurrent algorithms
 SC semantics is too expensive to implement on modern hardware (must add fences)
 Uppequestion many cases better to let

Unnecessary in many cases: better to let experts use WEAKER consistency semantics

C11 Memory Model

Nonatomics (Data)

- Intended for most users (data race-free)
- If no data races exist, they behave as SC
- If data races exist, all bets are off
- Validate standard sequential optimizations

Atomics (Synchronization)

- Intended for experts (data races permitted)
- Several consistency levels:
 SC
 - Release/acquire
 - Release/consume
 - Relaxed
- Weaker consistency => More reordering permitted by compilers and hardware

Uh Oh...

$$\begin{array}{ll} \nexists x. \operatorname{hb}(x, x) & (\operatorname{IrreflexiveHB}) \\ \forall \ell. \operatorname{totalorder}(\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a)\}, \operatorname{mo}) \land \operatorname{hb}_{\ell} \subseteq \operatorname{mo} & (\operatorname{ConsistentMO}) \\ \operatorname{totalorder}(\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid \operatorname{isSeqCst}(a)\}, \operatorname{sc}) \land \operatorname{hb}_{\operatorname{SeqCst}} \subseteq \operatorname{sc} & (\operatorname{ConsistentSC}) \\ \forall b. \operatorname{rf}(b) \neq \bot \iff \exists \ell, a. \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a) \land \operatorname{isread}_{\ell}(b) \land \operatorname{hb}(a, b) & (\operatorname{ConsistentRFdom}) \\ \forall a, b. \operatorname{rf}(b) = a \implies \exists \ell, v. \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a) \land \operatorname{isread}_{\ell}(v, b) \land \neg \operatorname{hb}(b, a) & (\operatorname{ConsistentRFna}) \\ \forall a, b. \operatorname{rf}(b) = a \land (\operatorname{mode}(a) = \operatorname{na} \lor \operatorname{mode}(b) = \operatorname{na}) \implies \operatorname{hb}(a, b) & (\operatorname{ConsistentRFna}) \\ \forall a, b. \operatorname{rf}(b) = a \land \operatorname{isseqCst}(b) \implies \operatorname{isc}(a, b) \lor \neg \operatorname{isSeqCst}(a) \land (\forall x. \operatorname{isc}(x, b) \Rightarrow \neg \operatorname{hb}(a, x)) & (\operatorname{RestrSCReads}) \\ \nexists a, b. \operatorname{hb}(a, b) \land \operatorname{mo}(\operatorname{rf}(b), a) \land \operatorname{iswrite}(a) \land \operatorname{locs}(a) = \operatorname{locs}(b) & (\operatorname{CoherentRR}) \\ \nexists a, b. \operatorname{hb}(a, b) \land \operatorname{mo}(\operatorname{rf}(b), a) \land \operatorname{iswrite}(a) \land \operatorname{locs}(a) = \operatorname{locs}(b) & (\operatorname{CoherentRW}) \\ \nexists a, b. \operatorname{hb}(a, b) \land \operatorname{mo}(\operatorname{rf}(a), a) \land \nexists c. \operatorname{mo}(\operatorname{rf}(a), c) \land \operatorname{mo}(c, a) & (\operatorname{AtomicRMW}) \\ \forall a. \operatorname{isrmw}(a) \land \operatorname{rf}(a) \neq \bot \Longrightarrow \operatorname{mo}(\operatorname{rf}(a), a) \land \nexists c. \operatorname{mo}(\operatorname{rf}(a), c) \land \operatorname{mo}(c, a) & (\operatorname{AtomicRMW}) \\ \forall a. \operatorname{isrmw}(a) \land \operatorname{rf}(a) \notin \{W_X(\ell, v), \operatorname{RMW}_X(\ell, v, v_{\operatorname{new}})\} & \operatorname{etc.} \\ \operatorname{rsElem}(a, b) & \stackrel{def}{=} \exists X. \operatorname{v_{\operatorname{new}}} \operatorname{lab}(a) \in \{\operatorname{R}_X(\ell, v), \operatorname{RMW}_X(\ell, v, v_{\operatorname{new}})\} & \operatorname{etc.} \\ \operatorname{rsElem}(a, b) & \stackrel{def}{=} \operatorname{sameThread}(a, b) \lor \operatorname{simw}(b) \\ \operatorname{rseq}(a, \stackrel{def}{=} \{a \cup \bigcup \{\operatorname{IrsElem}(a, b) \land \operatorname{mo}(a, b) \land (\forall c. \operatorname{mo}(a, c) \land \operatorname{mo}(c, b) \Rightarrow \operatorname{rsElem}(a, c)))\} \\ \operatorname{sw} \stackrel{def}{=} \{(a, b) \in \operatorname{hb} \mid \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a) \land \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(b) \\ \operatorname{hb} \stackrel{def}{=} (s, b) \in \operatorname{hb} \mid \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a) \land \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(b) \\ \operatorname{hb} \stackrel{def}{=} (a, b) \in \operatorname{hb} \mid \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a) \land \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(b)] \\ \operatorname{Asequestical} \stackrel{def}{=} \{(a, b) \in \operatorname{hb} \mid \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(a) \land \operatorname{iswrite}_{\ell}(b)] \\ \operatorname{supp}(a, f(a) \in f(a, b) \in \operatorname{hb} \mid \operatorname{supp}(a) \land f(a) \in f(a, c), c) \land \operatorname{mo}(c, b) \land \operatorname{supp}(c, c)) \\ \operatorname{supp}(a, f(a) \in f(a, b) \in \operatorname{hb} \mid \operatorname{supp}(a) \land f(a) \in \operatorname{supp}(a)$$

Uh Oh...



Our Contribution

GPS: a "modern" separation logic supporting a carefully restricted form of

- protocols
- ghost state
- ownership transfer

that is sound for the C11 weak memory model

Our major focus is showing how to reason about the **release-acquire** consistency mode.

Our Contribution

GPS: a "modern" separation logic supporting a carefully restricted form of

Takeaway Separation logic *can* make sense of (a form of) weak memory!

nodel

about

the *release-acquire* consistency mode.

Circular Buffers (Linux kernel)

$$\begin{array}{l} \{\texttt{true}\} \ \texttt{newBuffer}() \ \{q. \ \texttt{Prod}(q) * \texttt{Cons}(q)\} \\ \{\texttt{Prod}(q) * P(x)\} \ \texttt{tryProd}(q, x) \ \{z. \ \texttt{Prod}(q) * (z \neq 0 \lor P(x))\} \\ \{\texttt{Cons}(q)\} \ \ \texttt{tryCons}(q) \ \ \{x. \ \texttt{Cons}(q) * (x = 0 \lor P(x))\} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \texttt{newBuffer}() \triangleq \\ \texttt{let } q = \texttt{alloc}(N+2) \\ [q+\texttt{ri}]_{\texttt{at}} := 0; \\ [q+\texttt{wi}]_{\texttt{at}} := 0; \\ q \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \texttt{tryProd}(q, x) &\triangleq \\ \texttt{let } w = [q + \texttt{wi}]_{\texttt{at}} \\ \texttt{let } r = [q + \texttt{ri}]_{\texttt{at}} \\ \texttt{let } w' = w + 1 \mod N \\ \texttt{if } w' == r \texttt{then } 0 \\ \texttt{else } [q + \texttt{b} + w]_{\texttt{na}} := x; \\ [q + \texttt{wi}]_{\texttt{at}} := w'; \\ 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathtt{tryCons}(q) &\triangleq \\ & \texttt{let } w = [q + \mathtt{wi}]_{\mathtt{at}} \\ & \texttt{let } r = [q + \mathtt{ri}]_{\mathtt{at}} \\ & \texttt{if } w == r \texttt{then } 0 \\ & \texttt{else let } x = [q + \mathtt{b} + r]_{\mathtt{na}} \\ & [q + \mathtt{ri}]_{\mathtt{at}} := r + 1 \bmod N; \\ & x \end{aligned}$$

Nonatomics

$$\{\mathsf{true}\}\,\mathsf{alloc}_{\mathsf{na}}(v)\,\{x.\,x\hookrightarrow v\}$$

$$\{\ell \hookrightarrow -\} \, [\ell]_{\operatorname{na}} := v \, \{\ell \hookrightarrow v\}$$

$$\{\ell \hookrightarrow v\} \, [\ell]_{\mathrm{na}} \, \{x. \; x = v \ast \ell \hookrightarrow v\}$$

$$\frac{\{P_1\}e_1\{Q_1\}}{\{P_1*P_2\}e_1 \parallel e_2\{Q_1*Q_2\}} = \frac{\{P\}e\{x,Q\}}{\{P*R\}e\{x,Q*R\}}$$

A Brief Introduction to Release/Acquire



 $\begin{array}{l} [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array}$



 $\begin{array}{l} [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array}$

Under SC, both threads can lose.



 $\begin{array}{l} [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array}$

Under SC, both threads can lose. Under Rel/Acq, both threads can also *win*!



 $\begin{array}{l} [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [x]_{\texttt{at}} := 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array}$ $|x|_{at} := 1$





 $\begin{array}{l|l} [x]_{at} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [y]_{at} == 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [y]_{at} := 1 \\ \texttt{if} \ [x]_{at} == 0 \texttt{ then} \\ /* \textit{ crit. section */} \end{array}$ $|x|_{at} := 1$



"IRIW"



$$[x]_{at} := 1 \quad \left\| \begin{array}{c} [y]_{at} := 1 \end{array} \right\| \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \\ \operatorname{print} [y]_{at} \end{array} \right\| \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{print} [y]_{at} \\ \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \end{array} \right\| \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{print} [y]_{at} \\ \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \end{array}$$

Both threads can print 1, 0

No global total store ordering (unlike TSO)

Message Passing





Message Passing



If a thread sees a write, it sees everything that "*happened before*" that write





If a thread sees a write, it sees everything that "*happened before*" that write

Coherence



$$[x]_{at} := 1 \quad \left\| \begin{array}{c} [x]_{at} := 2 \end{array} \right\| \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \\ \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \end{array} \right\| \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \\ \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \end{array} \right\| \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \\ \operatorname{print} [x]_{at} \end{array}$$

$$Cannot \ get \ 1, \ 2 \ and \ 2, \ 1$$

Total store ordering at each *independent* location

Coherence




$\begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 1; \\ [x]_{at} \end{array} \end{array}$

$\begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} x \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} repeat \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} repeat \\ [x]_{at} \end{array}$



$\begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} x \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} repeat \\ [x]_{at} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array}$



$\begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} x \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} repeat \\ [x]_{at} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array}$



Protocol name: data



Protocol name: *flag*



Protocol name: data



 $data(\mathbf{0}, z) \triangleq z = 0$ $data(\mathbf{37}, z) \triangleq z = 37$

Protocol name: *flag*



Protocol name: data



 $data(\mathbf{0}, z) \triangleq z = 0$ $data(\mathbf{37}, z) \triangleq z = 37$

Protocol name: *flag*



$$flag(\mathbf{0}, z) \triangleq z = 0$$
$$flag(\mathbf{1}, z) \triangleq z = 1 \land$$

Resources vs. Knowledge

 $\ell \hookrightarrow v$



Lower bound; No stability check!

Resources vs. Knowledge





 $\Box P \Rightarrow \Box P * P$

Operation	Gain	Lose
Read	Knowledge	_
Write	_	Resources
CAS: Success	Resources	Resources
CAS: Failure	Knowledge	_

Operation	Gain	Lose
Read	Knowledge	_
Write	_	Resources
CAS: Success	Resources	Resources
CAS: Failure	Knowledge	-

 $\forall s' \sqsupseteq_{\tau} s. \forall z. \tau(s', z) \Rightarrow \Box Q$ $\left\{ \left[\ell : s \mid \tau \right] \right\} [\ell]_{\mathsf{at}} \left\{ z . \exists s' . \left[\ell : s' \mid \tau \right] * \Box Q \right\}$

 $\forall s' \sqsupseteq_{\tau} s. \forall z. \tau(s', z) \Rightarrow \Box Q$ $\left\{ \left[\ell : s \mid \tau \right] \right\} [\ell]_{\mathsf{at}} \left\{ z \, \exists s' \, \left[\ell : s' \mid \tau \right] * \Box Q \right\}$ Lower bound









$\begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} x \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} repeat \\ [x]_{at} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \end{array}$



 $\begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} := 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} = 37; \\ [y]_{at} := 1; \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} = 1; \\ [x]_{at} \end{array} \begin{array}{c|c} [x]_{at} = 1; \end{array} \end{array}$





$$\begin{aligned} flag(\mathbf{0}, z) &\triangleq z = 0\\ flag(\mathbf{1}, z) &\triangleq z = 1 \land \\ \hline x: 37 \quad data \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned} flag(\mathbf{0}, z) &\triangleq z = 0\\ flag(\mathbf{1}, z) &\triangleq z = 1 \land \\ \hline x: 37 \quad data \end{aligned}$$





$$data(\mathbf{0}, z) \triangleq z = 0$$
$$data(\mathbf{37}, z) \triangleq z = 37$$

$$\left\{ x: 37 \ data \right\}$$

 $[x]_{\mathsf{AT}}$

$$data(\mathbf{0}, z) \triangleq z = 0$$
$$data(\mathbf{37}, z) \triangleq z = 37$$

$$\left\{ x: 37 \ data \right\}$$

$$[x]_{AT}$$

{ $z. z = 37 \times x: 37 \ data$

Operation	Gain	Lose
Read	Knowledge	_
Write	_	Resources
CAS: Success	Resources	Resources
CAS: Failure	Knowledge	_

Ownership Transfer

$\begin{array}{l|l} [x]_{\texttt{na}} := 37; & || & \texttt{repeat} & [y]_{\texttt{at}} & \texttt{end}; \\ [y]_{\texttt{at}} := 1; & || & [x]_{\texttt{na}} \end{array}$

How can we verify this ownership transfer if the read of *y* can only gain **knowledge**?

Ownership Transfer



Ghost Resources

${P} e \{x. Q\}$ {P} e {x. Q * \exists i. Token(i)}

$\operatorname{Token}(i) * \operatorname{Token}(i) \Rightarrow \mathsf{false}$

Escrows

Creation

$$\frac{R * R \Rightarrow \mathsf{false}}{\{P\} e \{x. Q\}}$$

Escrows





Fulfillment $\frac{\{P\} e \{x. Q\}}{\{R * [R \rightsquigarrow P]\} e \{x. Q\}}$



$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}\mathbf{E}(\gamma) : \quad \left[\begin{array}{c} \overline{\gamma} : \diamond \right] \, \overline{\mathbf{Tok}} \right] & \rightsquigarrow \quad x \hookrightarrow 37 \\ \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{P}(\gamma)(0, z) & \triangleq \quad z = 0 \\ \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{P}(\gamma)(1, z) & \triangleq \quad z = 1 * [\mathbf{X}\mathbf{E}(\gamma)] \end{aligned}$$

Soundness

Soundness

...ask Viktor!

Principles of the Model

- Label *hb* (happens-before) edges with resources/knowledge
- "Concurrent" edges \Rightarrow compatible labels
- For each location, *mo* simulated by protocol

The Big Picture
What We've Done

- Extends Viktor's previous RSL logic
- Release-acquire protocols
- Ghost state and escrows
- Case studies:
 - Michael-Scott queue
 - Linux *bounded* ticket lock
 - Linux circular buffer
- Complete soundness proof in Coq!

What We've Done

- Extends Viktor's previous RSL logic
- Release-acquire protocols



- Linux circular buffer
- Complete soundness proof in Coq!

What We Want to Do

- Full C11:
 - Add release/consume
 - Add relaxed *reads*
 - Relaxed *writes* appear broken
- Refinement reasoning
- Weak data structure specifications