

# 15-213

*"The course that gives CMU its Zip!"*


## Time Measurement December 9, 2004

### Topics

- Time scales
- Interval counting
- Cycle counters
- K-best measurement scheme
- Related tools & ideas

class29.ppt

## Computer Time Scales



### Two Fundamental Time Scales

- **Processor:**  $\sim 10^{-9}$  sec.
- **External events:**  $\sim 10^{-2}$  sec.
  - Keyboard input
  - Disk seek
  - Screen refresh

### Implication

- Can execute many instructions while waiting for external event to occur
- Can alternate among processes without anyone noticing

# Measurement Challenge

## How Much Time Does Program X Require?

- CPU time
  - How many total seconds are used when executing X?
  - Measure used for most applications
  - Small dependence on other system activities
- Actual (“Wall”) Time
  - How many seconds elapse between the start and the completion of X?
  - Depends on system load, I/O times, etc.

## Confounding Factors

- How does time get measured?
- Many processes share computing resources
  - Transient effects when switching from one process to another
  - Suddenly, the effects of alternating among processes become noticeable

– 3 –

15-213, f04


# “Time” on a Computer System



real (wall clock) time

 = user time (time executing instructions in the user process)

 = system time (time executing instructions in kernel on behalf of user process)

 = some other user's time (time executing instructions in different user's process)

 +  +  = real (wall clock) time


We will use the word “time” to refer to user time.

 cumulative user time

– 4 –

15-213, f04

## Activity Periods: Light Load




- Most of the time spent executing one process
- Periodic interrupts every 10ms
  - Interval timer
  - Keep system from executing one process to exclusion of others
- Other interrupts
  - Due to I/O activity
- Inactivity periods
  - System time spent processing interrupts
  - ~250,000 clock cycles

- 5 -

15-213, f04

## Activity Periods: Heavy Load



- Sharing processor with one other active process
- From perspective of this process, system appears to be "inactive" for ~50% of the time
  - Other process is executing

- 6 -

15-213, f04

# Interval Counting

## OS Measures Runtimes Using Interval Timer


- Maintain 2 counts per process
  - User time
  - System time
- Each time get timer interrupt, increment counter for executing process
  - User time if running in user mode
  - System time if running in kernel mode

- 7 -


15-213, f04

# Interval Counting Example

## (a) Interval Timings



## (b) Actual Times



- 8 -

15-213, f04

## Unix time Command


```
time make osevent
gcc -O2 -Wall -g -march=i486 -c clock.c
gcc -O2 -Wall -g -march=i486 -c options.c
gcc -O2 -Wall -g -march=i486 -c load.c
gcc -O2 -Wall -g -march=i486 -o osevent osevent.c . . .
0.820u 0.300s 0:01.32 84.8%    0+0k 0+0io 4049pf+0w
```

- 0.82 seconds user time
  - 82 timer intervals
- 0.30 seconds system time
  - 30 timer intervals
- 1.32 seconds wall time
- 84.8% of total was used running these processes
  - $(.82+0.3)/1.32 = .848$

- 9 -

15-213, f04

## Accuracy of Interval Counting



Minimum

Maximum

- Computed time = 70ms
- Min Actual =  $60 + \epsilon$
- Max Actual =  $80 - \epsilon$


### Worst Case Analysis

- Timer Interval =  $\delta$
- Single process segment measurement can be off by  $\pm\delta$
- No bound on error for multiple segments
  - Could consistently underestimate, or consistently overestimate

- 10 -

15-213, f04

## Accuracy of Interval Counting (cont.)



Minimum

Maximum

- Computed time = 70ms
- Min Actual =  $60 + \epsilon$
- Max Actual =  $80 - \epsilon$

### Average Case Analysis

- Over/underestimates tend to balance out
- As long as total run time is sufficiently large
  - Min run time ~1 second
  - 100 timer intervals
- Consistently miss 4% overhead due to timer interrupts

- 11 -

15-213, f04

## Cycle Counters

- Most modern systems have built in registers that are incremented every clock cycle
  - Very fine grained
  - Maintained as part of process state
    - » In Linux, counts elapsed global time
- Special assembly code instruction to access
- On (recent model) Intel machines:
  - 64 bit counter.
  - RDTSC instruction sets `%edx` to high order 32-bits, `%eax` to low order 32-bits
- Aside: Is this a security issue?

- 12 -

15-213, f04

# Cycle Counter Period

## Wrap Around Times for 550 MHz machine

- Low order 32 bits wrap around every  $2^{32} / (550 * 10^6) = 7.8$  seconds
- High order 64 bits wrap around every  $2^{64} / (550 * 10^6) = 33539534679$  seconds
  - 1065 years

## For 2 GHz machine

- Low order 32-bits every 2.1 seconds
- High order 64 bits every 293 years

- 13 -

15-213, f04

# Measuring with Cycle Counter

## Idea

- Get current value of cycle counter
  - store as pair of unsigned's `cyc_hi` and `cyc_lo`
- Compute something
- Get new value of cycle counter
- Perform double precision subtraction to get elapsed cycles

```
/* Keep track of most recent reading of cycle counter */
static unsigned cyc_hi = 0;
static unsigned cyc_lo = 0;

void start_counter()
{
    /* Get current value of cycle counter */
    access_counter(&cyc_hi, &cyc_lo);
}
```

- 14 -

15-213, f04

## Accessing the Cycle Cntr.

- GCC allows inline assembly code with mechanism for matching registers with program variables
- Code only works on x86 machine compiling with GCC

```
void access_counter(unsigned *hi, unsigned *lo)
{
    /* Get cycle counter */
    asm("rdtsc; movl %%edx,%0; movl %%eax,%1"
        : "=r" (*hi), "=r" (*lo)
        : /* No input */
        : "%edx", "%eax");
}
```

- Emit assembly with `rdtsc` and two `movl` instructions

- 15 -

15-213, f04

## Closer Look at Extended ASM

```
asm("Instruction String"
    : Output List
    : Input List
    : Clobbers List);
}
```

```
void access_counter
(unsigned *hi, unsigned *lo)
{
    /* Get cycle counter */
    asm("rdtsc; movl %%edx,%0; movl %%eax,%1"
        : "=r" (*hi), "=r" (*lo)
        : /* No input */
        : "%edx", "%eax");
}
```

### Instruction String

- Series of assembly commands
  - Separated by “,” or “\n”
  - Use “%%” where normally would use “%”

- 16 -

15-213, f04



## Closer Look at Extended ASM

```
asm("Instruction String"
    : Output List
    : Input List
    : Clobbers List
)

void access_counter
(unsigned *hi, unsigned *lo)
{
    /* Get cycle counter */
    asm("rdtsc; movl %%edx,%0; movl %%eax,%1"
        : "=r" (*hi), "=r" (*lo)
        : /* No input */
        : "%edx", "%eax");
}
```

### Output List

- Expressions indicating destinations for values %0, %1, ..., %j
  - Enclosed in parentheses
  - Must be *lvalue*
    - » Value that can appear on LHS of assignment
- Tag "=r" indicates that symbolic value (%0, etc.), should be replaced by a register

- 17 -

15-213, f04

## Closer Look at Extended ASM

```
asm("Instruction String"
    : Output List
    : Input List
    : Clobbers List
)

void access_counter
(unsigned *hi, unsigned *lo)
{
    /* Get cycle counter */
    asm("rdtsc; movl %%edx,%0; movl %%eax,%1"
        : "=r" (*hi), "=r" (*lo)
        : /* No input */
        : "%edx", "%eax");
}
```

### Input List

- Series of expressions indicating sources for values %j+1, %j+2, ...
  - Enclosed in parentheses
  - Any expression returning value
- Tag "r" indicates that symbolic value (%0, etc.) will come from register

- 18 -

15-213, f04

## Closer Look at Extended ASM

```
asm("Instruction String"
    : Output List
    : Input List
    : Clobbers List
);

void access_counter
(unsigned *hi, unsigned *lo)
{
    /* Get cycle counter */
    asm("rdtsc; movl %%edx,%0; movl %%eax,%1"
        : "=r" (*hi), "=r" (*lo)
        : /* No input */
        : "%edx", "%eax");
}
```

### Clobbers List

- List of register names that get altered by assembly instruction
- Compiler will make sure doesn't store something in one of these registers that must be preserved across asm
  - Value set before & used after

- 19 -

15-213, f04

## Accessing the Cycle Cntr. (cont.)

### Emitted Assembly Code

```
movl 8(%ebp),%esi    # hi
movl 12(%ebp),%edi   # lo
#APP
    rdtsc; movl %edx,%ecx; movl %eax,%ebx
#NO_APP
    movl %ecx,(%esi)    # Store high bits at *hi
    movl %ebx,(%edi)    # Store low bits at *lo
```

- Used %ecx for \*hi (replacing %0)
- Used %ebx for \*lo (replacing %1)
- Does not use %eax or %edx for value that must be carried across inserted assembly code

- 20 -

15-213, f04

## Completing Measurement

- Get new value of cycle counter
- Perform double precision subtraction to get elapsed cycles
- Express as double to avoid overflow problems

```
double get_counter()
{
    unsigned ncyc_hi, ncyc_lo;
    unsigned hi, lo, borrow;
    /* Get cycle counter */
    access_counter(&ncyc_hi, &ncyc_lo);
    /* Do double precision subtraction */
    lo = ncyc_lo - cyc_lo;
    borrow = lo > ncyc_lo;
    hi = ncyc_hi - cyc_hi - borrow;
    return (double) hi * (1 << 30) * 4 + lo;
}
```

- 21 -

15-213, f04

## Timing With Cycle Counter

### Determine Clock Rate of Processor

- Count number of cycles required for some fixed number of seconds

```
double MHZ;
int sleep_time = 10;
start_counter();
sleep(sleep_time);
MHZ = get_counter() / (sleep_time * 1e6);
```

### Time Function P

- First attempt: Simply count cycles for one execution of P

```
double tsecs;
start_counter();
P();
tsecs = get_counter() / (MHZ * 1e6);
```

- 22 -

15-213, f04

# Measurement Pitfalls

## Overhead

- Calling `get_counter()` incurs small amount of overhead
- Want to measure long enough code sequence to compensate

## Unexpected Cache Effects

- artificial hits or misses
- e.g., these measurements were taken with the Alpha cycle counter:  
`foo1(array1, array2, array3); /* 68,829 cycles */`  
`foo2(array1, array2, array3); /* 23,337 cycles */`  
vs.  
`foo2(array1, array2, array3); /* 70,513 cycles */`  
`foo1(array1, array2, array3); /* 23,203 cycles */`

- 23 -

15-213, f04

# Dealing with Overhead & Cache Effects

- Always execute function once to “warm up” cache
- Keep doubling number of times execute `P()` until reach some threshold
  - Used `CMIN = 50000`

```
int cnt = 1;
double cmeas = 0;
double cycles;
do {
    int c = cnt;
    P();                      /* Warm up cache */
    get_counter();
    while (c-- > 0)
        P();
    cmeas = get_counter();
    cycles = cmeas / cnt;
    cnt += cnt;
} while (cmeas < CMIN); /* Make sure have enough */
return cycles / (1e6 * MHZ);
```

- 24 -

15-213, f04

# Multitasking Effects

## Cycle Counter Measures Elapsed Time

- Keeps accumulating during periods of inactivity
  - System activity
  - Running other processes

## Key Observation

- Cycle counter never underestimates program run time
- Possibly overestimates by large amount

## K-Best Measurement Scheme

- Perform up to N (e.g., 20) measurements of function
- See if fastest K (e.g., 3) within some relative factor  $\varepsilon$  (e.g., 0.001)




- 25 -

15-213, f04

## K-Best Validation

$K = 3, \varepsilon = 0.001$



### Very good accuracy for < 8ms

- Within one timer interval
- Even when heavily loaded

### Less accurate of > 10ms


- Light load: ~4% error
  - Interval clock interrupt handling
- Heavy load: Very high error

- 26 -

15-213, f04

# Compensate For Timer Overhead

$$K = 3, \varepsilon = 0.001$$



## Subtract Timer Overhead

- Estimate overhead of single interrupt by measuring periods of inactivity
- Call interval timer to determine number of interrupts that have occurred

## Better Accuracy for > 10ms


- Light load: 0.2% error
- Heavy load: Still very high error

- 27 -

15-213, f04

# K-Best on NT

$$K = 3, \varepsilon = 0.001$$



## Acceptable accuracy for < 50ms

- Scheduler allows process to run multiple intervals

## Less accurate of > 10ms

- Light load: 2% error
- Heavy load: Generally very high error

- 28 -

15-213, f04

## Time of Day Clock

- Unix `gettimeofday()` function
- Return elapsed time since reference time (Jan 1, 1970)
- Implementation
  - Uses interval counting on some machines
    - » Coarse grained
  - Uses cycle counter on others
    - » Fine grained, but significant overhead and only 1 microsecond resolution


```
#include <sys/time.h>
#include <unistd.h>

struct timeval tstart, tfinish;
double tsecs;
gettimeofday(&tstart, NULL);
P();
gettimeofday(&tfinish, NULL);
tsecs = (tfinish.tv_sec - tstart.tv_sec) +
        1e6 * (tfinish.tv_usec - tstart.tv_usec);
```

- 29 -

15-213, f04

## K-Best Using `gettimeofday`



### Linux

- As good as using cycle counter
- For times > 10 microseconds

### Windows

- Implemented by interval counting
- Too coarse-grained

- 30 -

15-213, f04

# Measurement Summary

## Timing is highly case and system dependent

- What is overall duration being measured?
  - > 1 second: interval counting is OK
  - << 1 second: must use cycle counters
- On what hardware / OS / OS version?
  - Accessing counters
    - » How `gettimeofday` is implemented
  - Timer interrupt overhead
  - Scheduling policy

## Devising a Measurement Method

- Long durations: use Unix timing functions
- Short durations
  - If possible, use `gettimeofday`
  - Otherwise must work with cycle counters
  - K-best scheme most successful

- 31 -

15-213, f04

# Profiling a Program

```
Gcc -gp -o foo foo.c
```

```
./foo
```

```
Gprof gmon.out
```

## How does this work?

- Samples PC periodically
- Adds code to count function calls
- Computes call-graph to attribute time

## Limitations?

- High error for very short functions
- Adds overhead to collect and save profile data
- Does not profile system calls
- Cannot deal with multiple processes
- Gets confused by multiple threads
- Needs special compilation (or at least linking)

## Uses:

- Identify targets for optimization

- 32 -

15-213, f04



## Digital's (RIP) Continuous Profiling Infrastructure

**Primary idea:** statistically sample PC all the time

**Attribute PC samples to basic blocks and use flow analysis on the static program execution graph**

### **Benefit:**

- Profiles everything all the time without need for modification of the executable image
- Low overhead (1-3%)
- Attributes dynamic cycles to individual instructions of the source program

### **Reference:**

*"Continuous Profiling: Where Have All the Cycles Gone?"*,  
J.M.Anderson,et.al, ASPLOS'97