Homework 2



Last Time

- To write C and C++ programs that work, you have to understand a lot of subtle issues
 - Signed / unsigned rules
 - Sequence points
 - Implementation defined behavior
 - Unspecified behavior
 - Undefined behavior
- The C99 Standard is a free download
 Google for n1124.pdf



Volatile

- How to use it
- > How not to use it





Example:

- This AVR has no hardware multiply unit
- Let's measure the speed of software multiply

Solution using Timer 1:

- Set timer to an appropriate rate
- > Read TCNT1
- > Do a multiply
- Read TCNT1 again
- Subtract first reading from second

Timer/Counter1 – TCNT1H and TCNT1L

Bit	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	_
				TCNT	1[15:8]				TCNT1H
	TCNT1[7:0]						TCNT1L		
Read/Write	R/W	R/W	R/W	R/W	R/W	R/W	R/W	R/W	•
Initial Value	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

\$31 (\$51)	OCR0		Timer/Counter0 Output Compare Register					106		
\$30 (\$50)	ASSR	-	-	-	-	AS0	TCN0UB	OCR0UB	TCR0UB	107
\$2F (\$4F)	TCCR1A	COM1A1	COM1A0	COM1B1	COM1B0	COM1C1	COM1C0	WGM11	WGM10	133
\$2E (\$4E)	TCCR1B	ICNC1	ICES1	-	WGM13	WGM12	CS12	CS11	CS10	136
\$2D (\$4D)	TCNT1H		Timer/Counter1 – Counter Register High Byte						138	
\$2C (\$4C)	TCNT1L		Timer/Counter1 – Counter Register Low Byte					138		
\$2B (\$4B)	OCR1AH		Timer/Counter1 – Output Compare Register A High Byte					138		
\$2A (\$4A)	OCR1AL		Timer/Counter1 – Output Compare Register A Low Byte					138		
\$29 (\$49)	OCR1BH		Timer/Counter1 – Output Compare Register B High Byte					138		
\$28 (\$48)	OCR1BL		Timer/Counter1 – Output Compare Register B Low Byte					138		
\$27 (\$47)	ICR1H	Timer/Counter1 – Input Capture Register High Byte					139			
\$26 (\$46)	ICR1L	Timer/Counter1 – Input Capture Register Low Byte					139			
\$25 (\$45)	TCCR2	FOC2	WGM20	COM21	COM20	WGM21	CS22	CS21	CS20	157
\$24 (\$44)	TCNT2	Timer/Counter2 (8 Bit)					159			

```
#define TCNT1 (*(uint16_t *)(0x4C))
```

```
signed char a, b, c;
```

```
uint16_t time_mul (void)
{
    uint16_t first = TCNT1;
    c = a * b;
    uint16_t second = TCNT1;
    return second - first;
```

\$ avr-gcc -Os -S -o - regl.c time_mul: lds r22,a lds r24,b rcall __mulqi3 sts c,r24 ldi r24,lo8(0) ldi r25,hi8(0)

ret

#define TCNT1 (*(volatile uint16_t *)(0x4C))

```
signed char a, b, c;
```

}

```
uint16_t time_mul (void)
{
    uint16_t first = TCNT1;
    c = a * b;
    uint16_t second = TCNT1;
    return second - first;
```

avr-gcc -Os -S -o - reg2.c
time_mul:
in r18,0x2c
in r19,0x2d
lds r22,a
lds r24,b
rcall <u>mulq</u> i3
sts c,r24
in r24,0x2c
in r25,0x2d
sub r24,r18
sbc r25,r19
ret

In a header file...

// Timer/Counter 1
#define TCNT1 (*(volatile uint16_t *)(0x4C))

// T/C 1 Input Capture Register
#define ICR1 (*(volatile uint16_t *)(0x46))
#define ICR1L (*(volatile uint8_t *) (0x46))
#define ICR1H (*(volatile uint8_t *) (0x47))

// T/C 1 Output Compare Register
#define OCR1B (*(volatile uint16_t *)(0x48))

ColdFire Example

C code you might write:

```
/* Enable signal as GPIO */
void make_pin0_gpio (void) {
    MCF_GPI0_PTCPAR = MCF_GPI0_PTCPAR_DTIN0_GPI0;
}
```

Relevant reprocessor definitions: typedef volatile uint8 vuint8; #define MCF_GPIO_PTCPAR \

(*(vuint8 *)(&__IPSBAR[0x10006F]))
#define MCF_GPIO_PTCPAR_DTIN0_GPIO (0)

ColdFire Example

After the C processor has run, the code is:
 void make_pin0_gpio (void) {
 (*(vuint8 *)(&_IPSBAR[0x10006F])) = (0);
 }
}



 Note: vuint8 * is pointer-to-volatile, not volatile-pointer

The distinction is crucial

Hardware register access is typically done using pointers-to-volatile

Compiler Output

_make_pin0_	gpio:			
0x00000000	link	a6,	#0	
0x0000004	moveq	# 0,	d 0	
0x0000006	move.b	d0,		_IPSBAR+1048687
0x000000C	unlk	a6		
0x0000000E	rts			

Another ColdFire Example



```
/* Enable signal as GPIO */
void make_pin0_gpio (void) {
    MCF_GPI0_PTCPAR |= MCF_GPI0_PTCPAR_DTIN0_GPI0;
}
```

Expands out to:

```
void make_pin0_gpio_bogus (void) {
   (*(vuint8 *)(&__IPSBAR[0x10006F])) |= (0) ;
}
```

Another ColdFire Example

_make_pin0_	gpio_bogu	1S:	
0x0000000	link	a6, #0	
0x0000004	move.b	IPSBAR+1048687,	d 0
0x0000000A	unlk	a6	
0x000000C	rts		
0x0000000E	nop		

What happened?
Is the code what we wanted?
Is the compiler correct?

Device Registers ≠ RAM

Each read may return a different value

- Free-running timer
- Writes may be ignored or result in undefined behavior
 - Read-only registers
 - Reads can be writes
 - > HCS12 interrupt flags cleared by writing 1
 - Reads and writes can be side effecting
 - Launch a missile, raise the control rods, ...

RAM-like semantics are ingrained in language and compiler design

- > Useless loads eliminated
- Redundant loads avoided by caching values in registers
- Operations with constant arguments evaluated at compile time
- Similar transformations for stores
- Memory behavior of optimized executable may be very different from source code

Basic problem: Optimizations are in tension with HW register accesses

- Improving the optimizer breaks programs that previously worked
 - Lots of latent errors in real embedded programs
 - Problems not seen because compiler aren't smart enough
- Today we look at creating embedded systems that can't be broken by any future optimizer

In early C there was no good solution

"At least one version of the UNIX Portable C Compiler (PCC) had a special hack to recognize constructs like

((struct xxx *)0177450)->zzz

as being potential references to I/O space (device registers) and would avoid excessive optimization involving such expressions"

ANSI C (a.k.a. C89) added volatile

Informal definition of volatile

- Every read/write to a volatile variable that would be performed by a C interpreter must result in a load/store in the executable code, in the same order
- Accesses shouldn't be added or removed
- Accesses shouldn't be reordered (much)

Volatile is a *type qualifier*

- Any type can be qualified
 - New types can be built from qualified types
 - Rules for volatile are similar to, but not the same as, const

Every level of indirection can be independently qualified:

int *p; volatile int *p_to_vol; int *volatile vol_p; volatile_int *volatile vol_p_to_vol;

Making a struct or union volatile is same as making all members volatile

Volatile bitfields are a little tricky

Does this make sense?

const volatile int *p_to_const_vol;

 Yes: This is the correct declaration for a read-only timer register

Uses for Volatile

- Volatile use 1: HW register accesses
- Volatile use 2: Data shared between interrupts and main()
- Volatile use

Volanne

-ween threads



#1: Not Enough Volatile

```
int done;
```

```
__attribute((signal)) void __vector_4 (void)
{
    done = 1;
}
void wait_for_done (void) {
    while (!done) ;
}
```

[regehr@babel ~]\$ avr-gcc -Os wait.c -S -o vector_4: push r0 in r0, SREG_ push r0 push r24 ldi r24, lo8(1) **Key property:** sts done, r24 Visibility pop r24 pop r0 out SREG, r0 pop r0 wait_for_done: reti .L3: wait_for_done: lds r24, done lds r24, done .L3: tst r24 Make done volatile tst r24 breq .L3 breq .L3 ret ret

#2: Too Much Volatile

- Some embedded developers make almost all globals volatile
 - Volatile is not a substitute for thinking
- Can seriously impact application performance
 - Hard to get the performance back since slow code is scattered everywhere

#3: Misplaced Qualifier

int *volatile REG = 0xfeed; *REG = new_val; • Oops! • Typedefs are helpful: typedef volatile int vint; vint *REG = 0xfeed;

#4: Inconsistent Qualification

In Linux 2.2.26
arch/i386/kernel/smp.c:125
volatile unsigned long ipi_count;
include/asm-i386/smp.h:178
extern unsigned long ipi_count;
2.3.x has similar problems
Modern compilers will catch this

- Typecasts are another way to get inconsistent qualification
- On't ignore compiler warnings about this!

#5: Ordering with Non-Volatile

```
volatile int ready;
int message[100];
```

```
void foo (int i)
{
    message[i/10] = 42;
    ready = 1;
}
```

\$ gcc-4.3 -03 barrier1.c -S -o foo:

movl	4(%esp), %ecx
movl	\$1717986919, %edx
movl	\$1, ready
movl	%ecx, %eax
imull	%edx
sarl	\$31, %ecx
sarl	\$2, %edx
subl	%ecx, %edx
movl	\$42, message(,%edx,4)
ret	

What happened?

- Non-volatile accesses can move around volatile accesses
- Volatile accesses cannot move around each other
 - Unless there are no intervening sequence points

Solution 1: Make all shared variables volatile

• Solution 2: Use a "compiler barrier"

Compiler Barrier

Tells the compiler:

- No code motion past the barrier in either direction
- Store all register values to RAM before the barrier
- Reload values from RAM into registers after the barrier

GCC Barrier

```
volatile int ready;
int message[100];
```

```
void foo (int i)
{
    message[i/10] = 42;
    asm volatile ("" : : : "memory");
    ready = 1;
}
```

\$ gcc-4.3 -03 barrier2.c -S -o foo:

movl	4(%esp), %ecx
movl	\$1717986919, %edx
movl	%ecx, %eax
imull	%edx
sarl	\$31, %ecx
sarl	\$2, %edx
subl	%ecx, %edx
movl	\$42, message(,%edx,4)
movl	\$1, ready
ret	

Compiler barriers are analogous to HW memory system barriers

- Not all compilers support barriers
 - CodeWarrior for ColdFire does not, unfortunately!
 - If not, inserting a call to an external function may work
- Good RTOS lock/unlock functions are compiler barriers
 - Often, only because they are not inlined
 - Problematic as compilers get smarter

Old Locks in TinyOS

```
char ___nesc_atomic_start (void)
{
  char result = SREG;
  __nesc_disable_interrupt();
  return result;
}
void ___nesc_atomic_end (char save)
{
  SREG = save;
```

}

New Locks in TinyOS

char__nesc_atomic_start(void)
{
 char result = SREG;
 __nesc_disable_interrupt();
 asm volatile("" : : : "memory");
 return result;
}

```
void __nesc_atomic_end(char save)
{
    asm volatile("" : : : "memory");
    SREG = save;
```

#6: Confuse Volatile and Atomic

- Accesses to volatile variables are not guaranteed to be atomic
 - C doesn't guarantee atomicity of any access
 - However, char-, short-, and int-sized accesses are often atomic
 - If you want atomicity, use a lock!

#7: Use Volatile on Modern Machines

- Volatile does not cause the compiler to emit memory fences or barriers
 - Consequently: Volatile is useless on out-of-order processors
- Volatile does not ensure visibility across a multiprocessor
 - Consequently: Volatile is useless on multicores

Solution:

- You must use a good lock implementation
- These contain sufficient barriers make race-free programs execute in a sequentially consistent manner
- In a well-synchronized program volatile just slows it down and hides real problems
 - Best not to hack your own synchronization primitives

#8: Assume the Compiler is Right

```
    Volatiles are frequently miscompiled
volatile int x;
void foo (void) {
    x = x;
}
$ msp430-gcc -0 vol.c -S -o -
foo:
    ret
```

What does volatile really mean?

We have to ask the standard

 \frown

- Section 6.7.3 the C99 standard contains most of the details
 - "An object that has volatile-qualified type may be modified in ways unknown to the implementation or have other unknown side effects."

More Standard

"What constitutes an access to an object that has volatile-qualified type is implementation-defined."

> What??

 Apparently this is designed to cover the fact that some platforms have a minimum memory access width

Volatile Summary 1

- Volatile can be good
- You need it for:
 - Accessing device registers
 - Communicating with interrupts
- It's usually not useful for anything else
- Be careful about the compiler
 - CodeWarrior for ColdFire has volatile bugs
 - I've reported all of them that I'm aware of...

Volatile Summary 2

- Locks with compiler and HW barriers give atomicity and visibility
- Volatile does not
 - No atomicity
 - No visibility on advanced HW
- If you have good locks, use them instead of volatile for shared data