Separating Functional and Parallel Correctness using Nondeterministic Sequential Specifications

Jacob Burnim, George Necula, Koushik Sen University of California, Berkeley

### Parallel Programming is Hard

- Key Culprit: Nondeterministic interleaving of parallel threads.
  - Painful to reason simultaneously about parallelism and functional correctness.
- Goal: Decompose efforts in addressing parallelism and functional correctness.
  - Allow programmers to reason about functional correctness sequentially.
  - Independently show correctness of parallelism.

# • **Goal:** Decompose efforts in addressing parallelism and functional correctness.



# • **Goal:** Decompose efforts in addressing parallelism and functional correctness.



 Goal: Decompose efforts in addressing parallelism and functional correctness.

Parallelism Correctness. Prove independently of complex & sequential function correctness.



Goal: Decompose efforts in addressing parallelism and functional correctness.

Parallelism Correctness. Prove independently of complex & sequential function correctness.

Want to be able to reason about functional correctness without parallel interleavings.



- Use sequential but nondeterministic specification for a program's parallelism.
  - User annotates intended nondeterminism.



 Use sequential but nondeterministic specification for a program's parallelism.
 User annotates intended nondeterminism.

Parallelism correct if adds **no unintended nondeterminism**.

Parallel

program

Can address functional correctness without parallel interleavings.

Nondeterministic sequential program/spec

Functional specification

### Outline

#### Overview

- Nondeterministic Sequential (NDSEQ)
   Specifications for Parallel Correctness
- Proving Parallel Correctness
- Future Work
- Conclusions

#### Goal: Find minimum-cost solution.

Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.

```
for (w in queue):
    if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
        continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

- Goal: Find minimum-cost solution.
  - Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.



#### • **Goal:** Find minimum-cost solution.

Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.



#### • **Goal:** Find minimum-cost solution.

Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.



- **Goal:** Find minimum-cost solution.
  - Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.



bound: 1

cost: 2

bound: 0

cost: 3

(b)

bound: 5

cost: 9

**(C)** 

queue: (a) best: ∞ best\_soln: •

```
for (w in queue):
    if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
        continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best_soln = w</pre>
```

























#### Goal: Find minimum-cost solution.

Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.

```
for (w in queue):
    if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
        continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

# How do we parallelize this code?

```
for (w in queue):
    if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
        continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

### Parallelizing our Example

- Goal: Find min-cost solution in parallel.
  - Simplified branch-and-bound benchmark.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best soln = w</pre>
```

#### Parallelizing our Example

- Goal: Find min-cost solution in parallel.
  - Simplified branch-an

Loop iterations can be run in parallel.

parallel-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost</pre>

best  $= \cos t$ best soln = w Updates to best are **atomic**.

#### Prove Parallelism Correct?

#### Claim: Parallelization is correct.

- If there are any bugs, they are **sequential**.
- Want to prove parallelization correct.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best soln = w</pre>
```

#### Prove Parallelism Correct?

#### • **Claim:** Parallelization is correct.

If there are any bugs, they are **sequential**.



```
cost = compute_cost(w)
atomic:
if cost < best:
best = cost
best soln = w
```

(b)

bound: 0

cost: 2

bound: 5

cost: 9

**(C)** 

queue: (a) best: ∞ best soln: •

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best soln = w</pre>
```

bound: 1

cost: 2



```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

prune?(**a**) update(**a**)

29



parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best = soln = w</pre>





parallel-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best = soln = w</pre>





(b)

bound: 0

cost: 2

bound: 5

cost: 9

(**c**)

queue: (a) best: ∞ best soln: •

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

bound: 1

cost: 2

(b)

bound: 0

cost: 2

queue: (a) best: ∞ best soln: •

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

bound: 1

cost: 2



**(C)** 

bound: 5

cost: 9



```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```





```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best = soln = w</pre>
```


```
parallel-for (w in queue):
    if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
        continue
        cost = compute_cost(w)
        atomic:
        if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best_soln = w</pre>
```



- Parallel and sequential not equivalent.
  - Claim: But parallelism is correct.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best = soln = w</pre>
```

Parallel and sequential not equivalent.
 Claim: But parallelism is correct.

Some nondeterminism is okay. Specification for the **parallelism** must indicate **intended** or **algorithmic** nondeterminism.

if cost < best: best = cost best\_soln = w

р

Use nondeterministic sequential (NDSEQ) version of program as spec for parallelism.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best_soln = w</pre>
```

nondet-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)

Use vers

Allow sequential code to perform iterations in a nondeterministic order. **NDSEQ**) rallelism.

parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best soln = w</pre>

nondet-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)

#### Specifies:

For every parallel execution, there must exist an NDSEQ execution with the same result.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best soln = w</pre>
```

nondet-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)





Does this NDSEQ specification really capture correctness of the parallelism?

parallel-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best\_soln = w</pre>

nondet-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)

## Recall: Our Approach

 Use sequential but nondeterministic specification for a program's parallelism.
 User annotates intended nondeterminism.

Parallelism correct if adds **no unintended nondeterminism**. Can address functional correctness without parallel interleavings.

Parallel program

47

Nondeterministic but sequential program/spec

Functional specification

## Recall: Our Approach

 Use sequential but nondeterministic specification for a program's parallelism.
 User annotates intended nondeterminism.

Prove **independently** of complex functional correctness. Can address functional correctness without parallel interleavings.

Parallel program

48

Nondeterministic but sequential program/spec

Functional specification

(b)

bound: 2

cost: 2

bound: 5

cost: 9

**(C)** 

queue: (a) best: ∞ best soln: •

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```

bound: 2

cost: 2

(b)

bound: 2

cost: 2

queue: (a) best: ∞ best soln: •

parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
cost = compute\_cost(w)
atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best = soln = w</pre>

bound: 2

cost: 2



**(C)** 

bound: 5

cost: 9



```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
    if cost < best:
        best = cost
        best = cost
        best = soln = w</pre>
```





parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best = soln = w</pre>





```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best = soln = w</pre>
```



queue:<br/>best: 2(a) bound: 2<br/>cost: 2(b) bound: 2<br/>cost: 2(c) bound: 5<br/>cost: 9best\_soln:Image: Cost of the second se

Parallel code can avoid pruning by interleaving iterations.

NDSEQ version must prune either (**a**) or (**b**).



queue:<br/>best: 2(a) bound: 2<br/>cost: 2(b) bound: 2<br/>cost: 2(c) bound: 5<br/>cost: 9best\_soln:•

Parallel code can avoid pruning by interleaving iterations.

NDSEQ **should** have freedom to **not** prune.



Allows NDSEQ version to nondeterministically not prune when pruning is possible.

parallel-for (w in queue):
 if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best = soln = w</pre>

nondet-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 if (\*): continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)

Claim: NDSEQ code a good specification for the correctness of the parallelism.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
  if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    continue
  cost = compute_cost(w)
  atomic:
    if cost < best:
       best = cost
       best = cost
       best soln = w</pre>
```

nondet-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 if (\*): continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)

## Recall: Our Approach

 Use sequential but nondeterministic specification for a program's parallelism.
 User annotates intended nondeterminism.

Prove parallel correctness independent of complex functional correctness. Can address functional correctness without parallel interleavings.

Parallel program

58

Nondeterministic but sequential program/spec

Functional specification

## NDSEQ Functional Correctness

#### Claim: much easier

- Consider recursive Boolean programs
- Consider Model Checking: Reachability
- Parallel Programs
  - pushdown system with multiple stacks
  - Undecidable [Ramalingam '00]
- Nondeterministic sequential programs
  - pushdown systems
  - **Decidable** [Finkel et al. '97, Bouajjani et al. '97, and others]

# Outline

#### Overview

- Motivating Example
- Nondeterministic Sequential (NDSEQ)
   Specifications for Parallel Correctness
- Proving Parallel Correctness
- Future Work

#### Conclusions

#### Specifies:

For every parallel execution, there exists an NDSEQ execution with the same result.

```
parallel-for (w in queue):
if (lower_bnd(w) >= best):
    if (*): continue
    cost = compute_cost(w)
    atomic:
        if cost < best:
            best = cost
            best = cost
            best = soln = w</pre>
```

nondet-for (w in queue):
if (lower\_bnd(w) >= best):
 if (\*): continue
 cost = compute\_cost(w)
 atomic:
 if cost < best:
 best = cost
 best = cost
 best = soln = w</pre>

Prove: For every parallel execution, there is an NDSEQ one yielding the same result.



Prove: For every parallel execution, there is an NDSEQ one yielding the same result.



Prove: For every parallel execution, there is an NDSEQ one yielding the same result.



Can we prove that such a rearrangement is always possible?



Is it always possible to move a prune? check later in a parallel execution without changing the result?



- Is it always possible to move a prune? check later in a parallel execution without changing the result?
  - > Yes if the check **does not** prune.



(1) Can prune?(x) move past prune?(y).



(1) Can prune?(x) move past prune?(y).



(2) Can prune?(x) move past update?(y).



(2) Can prune?(x) move past update?(y).



- This is proof by reduction [Lipton '75].
  - [Elmas, et al., POPL 09] has proved atomicity by reduction with SMT solvers.


## Outline

- Overview
- Motivating Example
- Nondeterministic Sequential (NDSEQ)
  Specifications for Parallel Correctness
- Proving Parallel Correctness
- Future Work + Conclusions

## Future Work

- Prove parallel-NDSEQ equivalence for real benchmarks.
  - Automated proofs using SMT solving.
- Combine with tools for verifying sequential programs with nondeterminism.
  - Model checking techniques (e.g., CEGAR)
- Also interested in dynamically checking NDSEQ specifications.

## NDSEQ and Debugging

- Given parallel execution exhibiting error:
  - Can we produce an NDSEQ trace exhibiting the same wrong behavior?
  - If so, bug is sequential and programmer can debug on a sequential (but NDSEQ) trace.
  - Can we efficiently produce NDSEQ trace given static proof of parallel correctness?
- Dynamically checking NDSEQ specs?
  - Ideally, efficiently: (1) finds equivalent
    NDSEQ trace, or (2) localizes parallel bug.

## **Questions?**

Email jburnim@cs.berkeley.edu

