

BEC: Bit-Level Static Analysis for Reliability against Soft Errors

Yousun Ko and Bernd Burgstaller

Yonsei University



CGO 2024 2024. 03. 05

What are Soft Errors?

- Transient bit flips by accident or on purpose. Stay until overwritten.
- On sequential logic (registers, internal flip-flops), combinational logic, DRAM, caches, signal buses etc.
- Real-world observations
 - 2128 single bit upsets in SRAM of a satellite during a 286 day mission in low-earth orbit [NBM+2021]
 - Linux kernel development delayed due to random memory corruption [Torvalds2022]





Diode Laser Station with Multi-Area upgrade option

Diode Laser Station with Microscope

Courtesy of RISCURE https://www.riscure.com

• Inject a soft error on hardware while a program is running, and observe the outcome



- Inject a soft error on hardware while a program is running, and observe the outcome
- Temporal-spatial location to inject a soft error can be narrowed down to live registers



- Inject a soft error on hardware while a program is running, and observe the outcome
- Temporal-spatial location to inject a soft error can be narrowed down to live registers



- Inject a soft error on hardware while a program is running, and observe the outcome
- Temporal-spatial location to inject a soft error can be narrowed down to live registers
- val is corrupted, error propagated to mod, and the control flow is diverted



Previous Approaches: Value-level and Dynamic

- Dynamic analysis
 - Performed on each program trace
 - Under-approximates. Analysis required for every run of a program
- Value-level analysis (Inject-on-Read)
 - Inject soft errors only when values are about to be read



Previous Approaches: Value-level and Dynamic

- Dynamic analysis
 - Performed on each program trace
 - Under-approximates. Analysis required for every run of a program
- Value-level analysis (Inject-on-Read)
 - Inject soft errors only when values are about to be read



The Proposed Approach: Bit-level Static Analysis

- Static analysis: BEC (Bit-level Error Coalescing) Analysis
 - The first bit-level static program analysis that tracks and classifies the effect of soft errors based on program semantics
 - Performed only once per program, at compile-time
 - Overapproximates. Analysis holds for any program run
 - Can be used by other compiler analyses and optimizations



Use Case 1: Fault Injection Campaign Pruning

- Inject soft errors only on bits whose effects are analytically distinguishable
- 16 fault injection runs \rightarrow 6 fault injection runs
- No loss in coverage



Use Case 2: Vulnerability-aware Instr. Scheduling

- The use case within the compiler
- Schedule instructions to minimize the number of live fault sites
- Scheduling a new instruction
 - at X adds 2 live fault sites
 - at Y adds 6 live fault sites





BEC: Bit-value Analysis

• Bit values help to understand the semantics of instructions

bb.odd

3

mul4 = SHL val, 2

- Forward data-flow analysis
- Abstract interpretation

2

mul8 = SHL val, 3

bb.even

• Performed once per value definition

val = XOR input, key

mod = ANDI val, 1

BEQZ mod, bb.even

4



BEC: Fault Index

- A Fault Index labels the effect of soft errors at each fault site
 - Fault index () is reserved for dead (ineffective) soft errors
- Equivalence relation
- Minimize the number of classes in the equivalence relation by coalescing



- Coalesces two equivalence classes if analysis finds fault indices to be equivalent
- Backward data-flow analysis
- Exploits the semantics of instructions
 - **ANDI** instruction may mask three most-significant bits



- Coalesces two equivalence classes if analysis finds fault indices to be equivalent
- Backward data-flow analysis
- Exploits the semantics of instructions
 - ANDI instruction may mask three most-significant bits
 - SHL instructions may mask two or three most-significant bits



- Coalesces two equivalence classes if analysis finds fault indices to be equivalent
- Backward data-flow analysis
- Exploits the semantics of instructions
 - ANDI instruction may mask three most-significant bits
 - SHL instructions may mask two or three most-significant bits
 - **BEQZ** instruction may coalesce fault indices within the instr



<key>

<val>

<mod>

10/13

- Coalesces two equivalence classes if analysis finds fault indices to be equivalent
- Backward data-flow analysis
- Probes every paths in the data-flow graph for any conflicts in guesses
- Overapproximates if the corrupted data is read by multiple sites



- Coalesces two equivalence classes if analysis finds fault indices to be equivalent
- Backward data-flow analysis
- Coalesces fault indices backward until the analysis reaches the fixed point
 - XOR instruction allows fault index coalescing irrespective of bit values



Experimental results: Fault Injection Pruning

	bitcount	dijkstra	CRC32	adpcm enc	adpcm dec	AES	RSA	SHA
Live in values	26 272	230 336	245 760	2 819 904	2 003 744	150 112	1 026 304	421 632
Live in bits	20 571	229 409	211 176	2 424 874	1 653 714	105 025	1 025 436	371 294
Masked bits	2 506	70	7 368	71 000	258 000	680	434	10 660
Inferrable bits	3 195	857	26 216	324 030	92 030	44 407	434	39 678
Total FI runs pruned	21.70 %	0.40 %	14.07 %	14.01 %	17.47 %	30.04 %	0.08 %	11.94 %

- Implemented in LLVM 16, validated and evaluated on RISC-V
- Pruned up to 30.04% (13.71% on average)
- Effectiveness varies by the benchmark characteristics
 - bitcount: Abundant bit operations 🙂
 - Adaptive differential pulse-code modulation: value quantization ☺
 - CRC32: Abstract Binary Interface 😳
 - RSA: arithmetic operations 😔
 - dijkstra: arithmetic and memory operations ☺
 - AES: memory operations but with bit-value agnostic machine instructions $\textcircled{\odot}$

Experimental results: Vulnerability-aware Instr. Sched.

	bitcount	dijkstra	CRC32	adpcm enc	adpcm dec	AES	RSA	SHA
Total fault space	541 696	27 286 528	2 922 496	58 426 368	44 085 248	3 180 544	18 295 808	7 483 392
Best reliability	85 018	159 966	348 384	28 401 348	19 400 720	1 928 214	8 650 606	2 559 116
Worst reliability	94 366	166 074	394 040	28 530 244	19 538 104	2 077 194	8 764 640	2 688 188
Worst/Best	111.00 %	103.82 %	113.11 %	100.45 %	100.71 %	104.10 %	101.32 %	105.04 %
Improved Reliability	+11.00 %	+3.82 %	+13.11 %	+0.45 %	+0.71 %	+4.10 %	+1.32 %	+5.04 %

- Implemented in LLVM 16, validated and evaluated on RISC-V
- Reliability improved up to 13.11% (4.94% on average)
 - Comparable to existing stand-alone methods
- The more dead fault sites the better
- Longevity of dead fault sites

More in the Paper and the Code!

- Pre-print: Yousun Ko and Bernd Burgstaller, *BEC: Bit-Level Static Analysis for Reliability against Soft Errors*, <u>https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.05753</u>
- Source code on GitHub: <u>https://github.com/yousunko/BEC</u>

More in the Paper and the Code!

- Pre-print: Yousun Ko and Bernd Burgstaller, *BEC: Bit-Level Static Analysis for Reliability against Soft Errors*, <u>https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.05753</u>
- Source code on GitHub: <u>https://github.com/yousunko/BEC</u>

Thank you! 🙂