Scheduling for the CompCert verified compiler

Sylvain Boulmé Léo Gourdin David Monniaux Cyril Six

VERIMAG

March 30, 2021









CompCert

Formally verified C compiler

project led by Xavier Leroy, then at INRIA, now at Collège de France

Non-commercial https://github.com/AbsInt/CompCert Commercial https://www.absint.com/compcert/index.htm

trace of execution = sequence of external calls, volatile read/writes

valid trace of execution at C level



same trace of execution at assembly level











Use case: traceability

Safe-critical systems (e.g. avionics)

Obligation to match object code to source

Conventional method: -00 and some manual inspection

CompCert replaces this by mathematical proofs.

Can use optimization.











Semantics and proofs in CompCert

Each intermediate language comes with a semantics written in Coq.

Optimization / transformation phases written in Coq. (Can call external untrusted OCaml code.)

Must prove simulation for each phase











Simulation proofs

Lockstep

one step of program before the transformation



one matching step of program after the transformation

More complex simulations replace sequences of steps by sequences of steps.











A menu

- oysters
- 2. veal blanquette
 - 2.1 prepare blanquette
 - 2.2 cook it
- 3. millefeuille
 - 3.1 puff pastry
 - 3.1.1 fold 1, wait 30 minutes
 - 3.1.2 fold 2, wait 30 minutes
 - 3.1.3 fold 3, wait 30 minutes
 - 3.1.4 fold 4, wait 30 minutes
 - 3.1.5 fold 5
 - 3.2 cream











Scheduling

"Official" CompCert produces instructions roughly in the source ordering.

Not the best execution order in general!

Especially on in-order cores.

Our solution: verified scheduling









Superblock scheduling

- Partition each function into superblocks: one entry point, possibly several exit points, no cycle
- 2. Possibly do some other reorganization: tail duplication, etc. to get bigger superblocks
- 3. Schedule the superblock (no proof needed)
- Witness through symbolic execution that the original and scheduled superblocks have equivalent semantics (proof needed)

Before register allocation, on IR.

On Kalray KVX and AArch64: reschedule basic blocks on assembly instructions after register allocation.



Equivalent semantics

- Same order of exit branches in original and scheduled superblock
- ► All live pseudo registers and memory have the same value at same exit point (non-live registers can differ)
- ► Same (or smaller) list of instructions that may fail (division by zero, memory access) reached at same exit point

Obtained by **symbolic execution**: two registers are considered equal if computed by exactly the same symbolic terms









Example

$$r_1 := a * b$$
 $r_3 := a - b$ $r_4 := a * b$ $r_5 := r_1 + c$ $r_7 := r_1 + c$ branch($a > 0$, EXIT1)

 r_1 and r_4 are both dead at EXIT1 and at final point.

These two blocks are **equivalent**: in both cases

$$r_2 = (a * b) + c$$
 and $r_3 = a - b$











Acceptable refinement

```
r_1 := a * b r_3 := a - b r_4 := a * b r_5 := a/b r_7 := a/b branch(a > 0, EXIT1) r_7 := a/b
```

 r_5 dead on EXIT1.

On x86, the division may fail:

- it's allowed to move it beyond the branch
- the converse is not allowed











Information needed

For all instructions

- ▶ latency: clock cycles between consuming operands and producing the value (or, more generally, a timetable of when each operand is consumed after the instruction is issued)
- resource consumption: CPU units in use that preclude other instructions being scheduled at the same time

Very difficult to find even for "open cores"!!! (Reverse-engineer gcc and LLVM?)











Current work in progress

Rewrite instructions sequences into equivalent sequences, on intermediate code

(Already implemented on assembly code after register allocation: rewrite multiple consecutive memory accesses into multiple load/stores, on KVX and AArch64)











Performance gain

| CPU | Differences in cycles spent (%) compared to | | | | | |
|------------|---|-----|-----|---------|-----|------|
| | no CSE3, no unroll | | | gcc -02 | | |
| | | | max | avg | min | max |
| Cortex-A53 | -16 | -63 | +3 | +10 | -23 | +87 |
| Rocket | -10 | -43 | +1 | +29 | 0 | +184 |
| Xeon | -21 | -56 | +4 | +21 | -3 | +189 |
| KV3 | -11 | -32 | +3 | +8 | -13 | +88 |









Suggested instruction: conditional move

Wanted by companies that want predictable hard real time code (fewer execution paths)

Branches are **bad** for worst-case execution time static analysis (Absint aIT, etc.)

Suggestion: add conditional moves for integer and floating-point registers at least on in-order cores











Suggestion: dismissible loads

An operation that may fail cannot be moved before a branch

$$r_1 := a + i << 3$$
 $r_1 := a + i << 3$

branch(
$$i > 3$$
, EXIT1) $r_2 := load_s(p)$

$$r_2 := load(p)$$
 branch($i > 3$, EXIT1)

Cannot be done if the load can fail.

Need special load returning a default value instead of trapping.

- easy without virtual memory
- needs OS collaboration with virtual memory











Dismissible load on KVX

```
8 cycles
1100:
 compw.ge $r32 = $r4, $r2
;;
 cb.wnez$r32? .L101
;;
 sxwd $r5 = $r4
 addw $r4 = $r4, 1
 lws.xs $r3 = r5[$r1]
;;
 addw r0 = r0, r3
 goto .L100
;;
```

```
.L100:
sxwd $r5 = $r4
compw.ge $r32 = $r4, $r2
lws.s.xs $r3 = $r5[$r1]
cb.wnez $r32? .L101
addw $r0 = $r0, $r3
addw $r4 = $r4, 1
goto .L100
```

6 cycles

A general call for collaboration

Need collaboration between

- compiler writers
- architecture / core designers
- operating systems (low level)

Our version of CompCert with optimizations not found in the "official" releases + the KVX target:

```
https://gricad-gitlab.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/
certicompil/compcert-kvx
```

Pre-pass scheduling: KVX; Cortex-A53/A35 (AArch64); Rocket, SweRV EH1 (Risc-V)

Post-pass scheduling: KVX; Cortex-A53/A35 (AArch64)









