

## The Design of a Distributed Model Checking Algorithm for



Gerard J. Holzmann  
joint work with Dragan Bošnački




NASA/JPL Laboratory  
for Reliable Software

<http://eis.jpl.nasa.gov/lars>  
<http://spinroot.com/gerard/>

## Multi-Core model checking

- Multi-Core has become the dominant trend
  - No More Moore
- To leverage this change:
  - Extend logic model checking algorithms
    - Not targeting special purpose hardware (clusters), but *desktops*
    - This means: *multi-core & shared memory*
    - Should be possible to get automatic scaling of performance with a growing number of cores
  - Support *all* verification & storage modes in Spin
    - Safety & *Liveness* (including LTL, up to  $\omega$ -regular properties)
    - Bitstate hashing, hashcompact, exhaustive storage, etc.
    - Partial order reduction should work the same
- A potential hurdle: distributed model checking algorithms
  - Have been studied for many years
    - Mostly targeting *compute clusters* – few target shared memory
    - Mostly restricting to *Safety properties* – no good solutions for *Liveness*
    - Results often incomparable – *few benchmarks*



dual-core  
Spin verification



## what can we hope to achieve

### design tradeoffs

CPU Performance:	copying 10 Kb
RAM to RAM (memcopy)	3 $\mu$ sec
RAM to network port	600 $\mu$ sec

### relevant factors


Model Checker Performance:	Multi-Core PC (Shared memory)	CPU-cluster (Distributed memory)
relative time to transfer a state to another CPU	1	200
relative time to generate a new state & check if it is previously visited	Fast mc: 10 Slow mc: 50	Fast mc: 10 Slow mc: 50

FMCAD2006


3

## what can we hope to achieve

speedup with increasing amounts of decoupling



**hypothesis 1:**  
unoptimized implementations will benefit more than optimized implementations of model checkers




**hypothesis 2:**  
multi-core platforms realize performance gains more easily than cluster computer systems (a 10-core PC may realize better performance than a 100-cpu cluster)

FMCAD2006

4

## basic framework

multi-core model checking, with shared memory



all shared work queues are bounded  
(they serve to achieve load balancing –  
when full, state handoffs can be skipped)

FMCAD2006

5

- At selected points in the search, a CPU can hand off a state to another CPU, by adding it to the target's work queue
  - Using algorithms for locking access to shared data, and for distributed termination detection (verifiable with standard Spin.)
  - The state space arena can be shared (default) or non-shared (optional)
- A Spin extension for *dual-core*
  - ~ 900 lines of new code, supporting all relevant verification modes including *LTL*, compatible with partial order reduction – *no* increase in computational complexity
  - The dual-core algorithm for *safety* properties scales to *N*-core systems – verification of *liveness* properties so far benefits only dual-core (i.e., it is an open problem to do liveness verification on *N*-cores without increase in computational complexity)

## sample output of a dual-core Spin run

```

$ spin -a petersonN
$ cc -DNOREDUCE -DDUAL_CORE -o pan pan.c
$ ./pan -z10000 -w27
states stored  cpu1 308054  cpu2 106219  ratio: 2.9
states matched  cpu1  90618  cpu2  43409  ratio: 2.1
(Spin Version 4.3.0 -- 8 October 2006)
+ Dual Core Processing
+ Partial Order Reduction


Hash-Compact 4 search for:
never claim          - (none specified)
assertion violations +
cycle checks         - (disabled by -DSAFETY)
invalid end states   +

State-vector 44 byte, depth reached 10000, errors: 0
414273 states, stored
134027 states, matched
548300 transitions (= stored+matched)
0 atomic steps
hash conflicts: 145 (resolved)

Stats on memory usage (in Megabytes):
23.199 equivalent memory usage for states (stored*(State-vector + overhead))
10.045 actual memory usage for states (compression: 43.30%)
State-vector as stored = 12 byte + 12 byte overhead
1073.742 memory used for hash table (-w27)
1296.000 memory used for DFS stack (-m27000000)
1024.000 memory used for shared work-queues
1073.741 other (proc and chan stacks)
3453.529 total actual memory usage

unreached in proctype user
line 57, state 30, "-end-"
(1 of 30 states)
cpu1: done, 706 Mb of shared state memory left
    
```

poor load balancing  
in this case




FMCAD2006

6

## state handoff heuristics for liveness properties

- any “irreversible transition” in the state reachability graph can serve to split the state space
  - separates state space into disjoint parts
  - these transitions can be used to define state *handoff* points
- trivial application to Spin’s nested depth-first search algorithm for proving liveness:
  - the handoff point is the start of the nested search
  - state spaces can be non-shared (since they are disjoint anyway)
  - should give an immediate (nearly) 2-fold speedup on dual-core systems for all liveness properties




for an irreversible transition there are *no return edges* across the handoff point: the two parts of the state reachability graph are disjoint

FMCAD2006

7

## state handoff heuristics for safety properties

- what if there is no suitable irreversible transition?
- we want to achieve:
  - load balancing*, but retain the benefits of depth-first search and change as little as possible in the search algorithms in Spin
  - sufficient decoupling* of cpu’s (a cpu should be able to do at least N steps with a newly received state, before it hands it off again)
- heuristic used: a handoff depth of modulo N steps (e.g., N: 10..1000)
  - method is intuitively simple
  - giving user control over load-balancing
- generalizes to N-core systems
  - should give near N-fold speedups on N cores



using a shared hash-table each cpu builds a dfs-stack of N steps and then hands off any successor at level N+1


FMCAD2006

8

## performance of this method


model: leader election in a uni-directional ring (Dolev, Klawe & Rodeh 1982)  
 problem size: 7 nodes in ring (723K reachable states *without* p.o. reduction)  
 comparison of runtime requirements for safety (*left*) and liveness (*right*):  
 single-core standard Spin verification **blue**  
 dual-core verification new algorithm **green**

### safety only



assertions, freedom of deadlock, etc.  
 (with a fixed handoff depth)


### liveness



$\square \langle \rangle \text{oneleader}$   
 (never claim and nested dfs increase runtime)

## sensitivity to the chosen handoff depth

the characteristic bathtub curve



## distributed termination detection

```

/* cf. EWD998 "Shmuel Safra's version of termination detection," 15 Jan. 1987. */
mtype = { Query, Quit, Work };
chan q[2] = [32] of { mtype, byte };

active [2] proctype N()
{
    bool done = false;
    byte s, r, n;

    assert(_pid == 0 || _pid == 1);
    q[1 - _pid]!Work,0; s++; /* seed work items */

accept:
    do /* the algorithm itself: */
    :: q[_pid]?Work,0 -> r++;
        if
        :: (n < 16) -> q[1 - _pid]!Work,0; s++
        :: true
        fi
    :: empty(q[0]) && !done && _pid == 0 -> /* only node 0 can initiate termination */
        done = true; /* remember that we sent the Query msg */
        q[1]!Query,s
    :: q[_pid]?Quit,0 -> /* only node 1 receives this */
        assert(_pid == 1); /* node 1 can now terminate */
        break
    :: q[_pid]?Query,n ->
        if
        :: _pid == 1 -> q[0]!Query,r /* respond to termination query from 0 */
        :: _pid == 0 -> /* process response to our termination query */
            if
            :: n == s -> q[1]!Quit,0; break /* accepted; node 0 terminates */
            :: else -> done = false /* try again */
            fi
        fi
    od;
    assert(empty(q[_pid]))
}

```

FMCAD2006

11

## Peterson's mutual exclusion algorithm (1981)

```

bool turn, flag[2];
byte ncrit;

active [2] proctype user() /* two processes */
{
    assert(_pid == 0 || _pid == 1);
    do /* do forever */
    :: flag[_pid] = 1; turn = _pid;
        do /* wait */
        :: flag[1 - _pid] != 0 ->
            if
            :: turn != 1 - _pid
            :: else -> break
            fi
        :: else -> break
        od;
        ncrit++;
        assert(ncrit == 1); /* in critical section */
        ncrit--;
        flag[_pid] = 0
    od
}

```

peterson.c: a fix: add memory barriers

```

#define MB() __asm__ __volatile__ ( "mfence" ::: "memory" )

MB();
while ("sh_flag1 == 1 && *sh_turn == 1)
{
    MB();
}

```

FMCAD2006

12



Surprise: a straight C implementation does **not** necessarily guarantee mutual exclusion.

A reference implementation in C on a 3.2 GHz dual-core Intel Pentium D – reveals a low probability of mutex violations... (~ 1 in 10<sup>6</sup>).

It is caused by out of order execution optimization in the chip itself (not visible in the assembly code).

**Note**

Many modern CPUs reorder instruction execution and memory accesses to improve execution efficiency. Such processors internally give some way to force ordering in a stream of memory accesses, typically through a memory barrier instruction. Implementation of Peterson's and related algorithms on an out-of-order processor generally require use of such operations to work correctly to keep sequential operations from happening in an incorrect order.

Most such CPUs also have some sort of guaranteed atomic operation, such as XCHG on x86 processors and Load-Linked/Store-Conditional on ARM, MIPS, PowerPC, and other architectures. These instructions are intended to provide a way to build synchronization primitives more efficiently than can be done with pure shared memory approaches.

**See also**

- Dekker's algorithm
- Lamport's bakery algorithm

## the alternative....



```
int
tas(volatile int *s)
{ int r;

  __asm__ __volatile__(
    "xchgl %0, %1\n\t"
    : "=r"(r), "=m"(*s)
    : "0"(1), "m"(*s)
    : "memory");

  return r;
}
```

Ugly, but it works, and is fast


Introduces a first platform dependency:  
different definition of the test&set  
instruction for each CPU-type  
(luckily there aren't many different  
CPU types in use today)

FMCAD2006



13

## more examples (dual-core – i.e., the maximal reduction is 50%)

data for runs *without* partial order reduction – to secure identical state space sizes are explored  
fixed handoff depth – safety properties only



**hypothesis:** the gain for un-optimized code will be larger than for optimized code




FMCAD2006

15

## adding partial order reduction the cycle proviso

- to avoid infinite deferral of transitions (the infamous ignoring problem) the standard algorithm checks if any successors are on the dfs stack (the "cycle proviso")
- but we don't have a full dfs stack in multi-core searches – the stack is split across two or more cpus
- two modifications of the cycle proviso are sufficient to restore soundness and completeness: \*)
  - a full expansion of successor states is done for each 'border state' (since we cannot tell if the handed off states are on the stack)
  - previously visited states that are generated by any cpu with a lower pid, are treated as if they are on the dfs stack
- the cycle proviso works as before elsewhere in the search



\*) formal proof courtesy Dragan Bosnacki

FMCAD2006


16




# dining philosophers

with and without partial order reduction

with partial order reduction




without




no major differences  
(the partial order reduction algorithm is  
not very effective on this particular problem)

# another example: Peterson's algorithm

with and without partial order reduction (log scales)



without partial order reduction



with partial order reduction

a surprise: partial order reduction  
can make the advantage of  
dual-core processing disappear  
but why?



## a reference model


```

#define BranchSize 8
#define StateSize 500
#define TransTime 9 /* 9 = 1 usec ; 13 = 16 usec */
#define NStates 500000

int count;
byte filler[StateSize];

active [BranchSize] proctype test()
{
end: do
  :: d_step {
    count < NStates ->
    c_code {
      int xi; /* transition delay */
      for (xi = 0; xi < (1 << TransTime); xi++)
      {
        now.filler[xi%StateSize] += xi%256;
      }
      memset(now.filler, 0, StateSize*sizeof(char));
    };
    count++;
  }
od
}

```




study effect of:  
branch factor  
state size  
transition time


FMCAD2006

19


## measurements dual:single ratios (best value is 0.5)




1



2



3



4

FMCAD2006

20

## synopsis

- multi-core algorithms do best for verification problems with:
  - larger state sizes (over 100 bytes)
  - larger branch factors (lots of non-determinism)
  - long transition delays (e.g., embedded C-code)
- they give no performance improvement for:
  - small state sizes (less than 100 bytes)
  - small branch factors (less than 2)
  - short transition delays (less than 1  $\mu$ sec)
- there are cases where a multi-core model checking algorithm *cannot compete* with a well-tuned single-core model checker
  - e.g., *deterministic*, models – irrespective of state space size or number of CPU cores...
  - search and compilation *optimization can reduce the benefit* of multi-core model checking (i.e., they benefit single-core algorithms)
  - specifically: *partial order reduction methods reduce the benefit* of distributed model checking
- next challenge: is there an efficient (N>2)-core liveness verification algorithm....?



dual-core  
model checking

