Advanced Operating Systems: Lab 2 - IPC

Lecturelet 2 Prof. Robert Watson 2022-2023



Lab 2 objectives

- Use, and extend, the skills developed in Lab 1
- Trace user-kernel interactions via syscalls and traps
- Explore the performance implications of virtualmemory optimisation of the pipe IPC primitive
- Use DTrace and hardware performance counters (HWPMC) to analyse these properties
- Overall: Now have learned a bit about the available tools, let's do some root-cause analysis of OS behaviour ...

New documents

- Advanced Operating System: Hardware Performance Counters (HWPMC)
 - Introduction to performance counters in this lab
 - You may wish to refer to the ARMv8-A and A72 manuals (or not)
- 3x lab documents:
 - Advanced Operating Systems: Lab 2 IPC General information
 - Advanced Operating Systems: Lab 2 IPC Part II assignment
 - Advanced Operating Systems: Lab 2 IPC L41 assignment
- Important: The Part II and Part III/ACS assignments are different – please do the right one!
- However, L41 students might find the Part II assignment useful to think about potential analysis strategies



Rough framing

- Inter-Process Communication (IPC) is an essential component to using the Process Model
 - Isolated boxes that can't talk to anything aren't very useful
- IPC design considers both semantics and performance:
 - Message passing vs shared memory?
 - Stream vs datagram?
 - Synchronous vs. asynchronous?
 - Portability to other OSes, communication semantics?
- Many years of research into two intertwined question:
 - What is the best IPC API?
 - How can we make it perform well?
- Once there is a defined API .. OS designers try to find the most efficient implementation
- Use DTrace and performance counters to explore the performance impact of VM optimisation on pipe IPC



Pipe VM optimisation

- Pipe API specifies copy semantics
 - Once a write(2) call returns, changes to memory in the sender do not affect data received in the recipient via read(2)
 - Practical implementation copy two times
 - 1. From userspace sender buffer to kernel buffer (copyin(9))
 - 2. From kernel buffer to userspace recipient buffer (copyout(9))
 - But memory copying is known to be expensive with both historic and contemporary microarchitectures
- In 1996, John Dyson implemented VM optimisations for bulk pipe data transfer for FreeBSD
 - Remove sender copy by "borrowing" pages for "large" sends
 - kern.ipc.pipe_mindirect sysctl tunes definition of "large": Use 2x copies < pipe_mindirect, 1x copies >= pipe_mindirect
 - Later also adopted in macOS; similar optimisations elsewhere
- Is this a good idea...? Answer this question in your lab.



Hardware performance counters (1/2)

- Seems simple enough:
 - Source code compiles to instructions
 - Instructions are executed by the processor
- But some instructions take longer than others:
 - Register-register operations generally single-cycle (or less)
 - Multiply and divide may depend on the specific numeric values
 - Floating point may take quite a while
 - Loads/stores cost different amounts depending on TLB/cache use
- Instruction count is not a good way to understand computational expense



Hardware performance counters (2/2)

- Optimisation is therefore not just about reducing instruction count
 - Optimisation must take into account micro-architectural effects
 - TLB/cache effects tricky as they vary with memory footprint
 - How can we tell when the cache overflows?
- Hardware performance counters let us directly investigate architectural and micro-architectural events
 - Architectural events: #instructions, #loads/stores, #branch returns, etc.
 - Microarchitectural: #bus accesses, #cache misses, #DRAM traffic, #missed branches...



Sketch of ARM Cortex A-8 memory hierarchy (This is not the CPU you are using, just an illustration!)

- Architectural refers to an ISA-level view of execution
- Micro-architectural refers to behaviours below the ISA



This is a very, very rough sketch indeed!

Reminder: High-density Cortex A-72 slide (Some of this information will be useful only for later labs)

arm CORTEX[®]-A72





The L1 memory system consists of separate instruction and data caches.

The L1 instruction memory system has the following features:

- 48KB 3-way set-associative instruction cache.
- Fixed line length of 64 bytes.
- Parity protection per 16 bits. .
- . Instruction cache that behaves as Physically-indexed and physically-tagged (PIPT).
- Least Recently Used (LRU) cache replacement policy.
- MBIST support. .

The L1 data memory system has the following features:

- 32KB 2-way set-associative data cache.
- Fixed line length of 64 bytes.
- ECC protection per 32 bits.
- Data cache that is PIPT.
- Out-of-order, speculative, non-blocking load requests to Normal memory and non-speculative, non-blocking . load requests to Device memory.
- LRU cache replacement policy.
- Hardware prefetcher that generates prefetches targeting both the L1 data cache and the L2 cache.
- MBIST support.

The features of the L2 memory system include:

- Configurable L2 cache size of 512KB, 1MB, 2MB and 4MB.
- Fixed line length of 64 bytes.
- Physically indexed and tagged cache.
- 16-way set-associative cache structure.

The MMU has the following features:

- 48-entry fully-associative L1 instruction TLB. •
- 32-entry fully-associative L1 data TLB for data load and store pipeline
- 4-way set-associative 1024-entry L2 TLB in each processor.
- Intermediate table walk caches.
- The TLB entries contain a global indicator or an Address Space Identifier (ASID) to permit context switches without TLB flushes.

Per-Core: L1 I-Cache: 48K

Per-Core:

L1 D-Cache: 32K

Shared: L2 Cache: 1M

Per-Core: MMU I-TLB: 48, D-TLB: 32, L2-TLB: 1024



Advanced Operatines containa Wirth Machine Identifier (VMID) to permit virtual machine

* Our benchmarks use only the first core to simplify analysis

switches without TLB flushes.

Using performance counters

- Recall:
 - Architectural counters: What software asks the hardware to do
 - Microarchitectural counters: How the hardware implements it
- Optimising software using performance counters is subtle
 - Often counter use leads to important micro-optimisations (e.g., "Cache lines are thrashing → lay out memory better")
 - But must consider whether algorithmic optimisation is preferable to microarchitecture-centric tuning
- A few considerations:
 - It may be preferable to ask the hardware to do less work, "inefficiently", than to do more work, "efficiently"
 - It is hard to know whether a change is important (e.g., doubling TLB misses might be critical .. Or irrelevant .. Context is required)
 - Microarchitecturally-aware optimisations may tune well for one specific microarchitecture, yet perform badly on another
- Microarchitecturally motivated optimisations must be carefully evaluated, ideally across >1 microarchitectures

The benchmark

```
root@rpi4-000:/data # ipc/ipc-benchmark
ipc-benchmark [-Bgjqsv] [-b buffersize] [-i pipe|local|tcp] [-n iterations]
    [-p tcp port] [-P arch|dcache|instr|tlbmem] [-t totalsize] mode
Modes (pick one - default 1thread):
    1thread
                IPC within a single thread
    2thread
                IPC between two threads in one process
    2proc
                IPC between two threads in two different processes
    describe
                Describe the hardware, OS, and benchmark configurations
Optional flags:
                           Run in bare mode: no preparatory activities
    -B
                           Enable getrusage(2) collection
    -a
    -i pipe|local|tcp
                           Select pipe, local sockets, or TCP (default: pipe)
                           Output as JSON
    -i
                           Set TCP port number (default: 10141)
    -p tcp port
    -P arch|dcache|instr|tlbmem Enable hardware performance counters
                           Just run the benchmark, don't print stuff out
    -q
                           Set send/receive socket-buffer sizes to buffersize
    -s
                           Provide a verbose benchmark description
    -\mathbf{v}
    -b buffersize
                           Specify the buffer size (default: 131072)
    -n iterations
                           Specify the number of times to run (default: 1)
```

- -t totalsize Specify the total I/O size (default: 16777216)
- Simple, bespoke IPC benchmark: pipes and sockets
- Adjust user and kernel buffer sizes

(v))

Advanced Operating Systems - Lab 2 - IPC

The benchmark (2)

- Use only one of its operational modes: 2thread IPC between two threads
- Adjust IPC parameters:
 - -b *buffersize*
 - -i pipe
 - -P mode

Set user IPC buffer size Use pipe() IPC Configure HWPMC

Output flags:

- -g Display getrusage(1) statistics
- -j Output as JSON
- -v Verbose output (more configuration detail)



Performance counter modes

- We have adapted the benchmark to use libpmc
- We use only counting mode, not sampling mode
- The A-72 supports up to six counters enabled at a time
 - We always enable instruction and cycle counting
 - The other 4 are used for specific groups of counters

| -P mode | Category |
|---------|--|
| arch | Architectural (ISA-level) statistics (some speculative*) |
| dcache | L1-D and L2 cache statistics |
| instr | L1-I and branch-prediction statistics |
| tlbmem | D-TLB / I-TLB and memory access/bus access statistics |

- You will need to run the benchmark for each counter set
 - ... But it is reasonable to limit to one iteration each
- The probe effect affects hardware counters, too!

*Non-speculative counters can be quite expensive in the microarchitecture for superscalar processors, so Arm has chosen not to provide architectural counters





```
"benchmark_configuration": {
    "buffersize": 131072,
    "totalsize": 16777216,
    "msgcount": 128,
    "mode": "2thread",
    "ipctype": "pipe",
    "pmctype": "arch",
    "iterations": 1
},
```

Benchmark configuration



```
"benchmark_samples": [
 "bandwidth": 609733.59,
 "time": "0.026870752",
 "stime": "0.023513",
 "utime": "0.000165",
 "msgsnd": 128,
 "msgrcv": 256,
 "nvcsw": 523,
 "nivcsw": 0,
 "INST RETIRED": 7807526,
 "CPU CYCLES": 10659620,
 "LD SPEC": 2776279,
 "ST_SPEC": 1675676,
 "EXC RETURN": 458,
 "BR RETURN SPEC": 135871,
  "CYCLES PER INSTRUCTION": 1.365301
```

Performance / wallclock time

Sampled execution time in userlevel/kernel

Getrusage(2) statistics

Hardware performance counters (and derived metrics)



Plotting, exploring, and explaining graphs (1/2)

Graphs are an essential part of your lab submissions

- Graphs make patterns in data accessible visually
 - They represent hypotheses in data exploration
 - They make **arguments** in data presentation and explanation
- When explaining graphs, focus on trends, inflection points, and surprising artifacts
 - Partition graph into regions of similar behaviour
 - Label and annotate inflection points
 - Explain why different partitions behave the way they do
- Quality of presentation is really important
 - Ensure that they are clearly labeled axes, legend, etc.
 - Think carefully about what axes and scales to use
 - Visual comparison is key present data on the same plot, or in stacked plots, if you want to invite comparison
 - E.g., ensure that the reader can see the relationship in your plots



Plotting, exploring, and explaining graphs (2/2)



A few concluding thoughts

- You are now (fairly) familiar with:
 - DTrace as an instrumentation tool
 - JupyterLab as a data collection, analysis, presentation tool
- You will now pick up new skills:
 - Further DTrace experience e.g., system-call provider, profile provider, perhaps scheduling provider, etc.
 - Performance counter experience (can be hard to interpret...)
- When gathering and analysing data:
 - Start with short runs (even -n 1) to allow quick iteration
 - Plot data to understand its behaviour
 - Pay attention to inflection points, regions of commonality
 - Mark up graphs with key hardware, software thresholds
 - Remember that the cache/TLB footprint of a workload will (almost certainly) not be the benchmark buffer size
- We are now doing comparative analysis...



How to contact us

- Attend the lab!
- Course slack outside of lab hours, or if unable to join
 - advopsys.slack.com
- Also possible: Email to the lecturer
 - robert.watson@cl.cam.ac.uk

