

Run-time verification for real-time application

Linux Plumbers Conference 2025

Nam Cao Linutronix GmbH



Motivation

- Kernel is real-time capable
- Userspace often is not:
 - Mutex without PI
 - Not mlock memory → page faults
 - Use the RT-unsafe API (e.g. timerfd)

Run-time verification monitors can help detect common userspace mistakes



The run-time monitors use trace points and verify that:

- Real-time tasks do not raise page faults
- RT tasks are not woken by lower-priority tasks or softirq
- A task going to sleep must mean:
 - clock_nanosleep (abstime, monotonic or TAI clock)
 - futex_wait
 - epoll_wait



The run-time monitors use trace points and verify that:

- Real-time tasks do not raise page faults
- RT tasks are not woken by lower-priority tasks or softirq
- A task going to sleep must mean:
 - clock_nanosleep (abstime, monotonic or TAI clock)
 - futex_wait
 - epoll_wait

Are the above rules complete?



The run-time monitors use trace points and verify that:

- Real-time tasks do not raise page faults
- RT tasks are not woken by lower-priority tasks or softirq
- A task going to sleep must mean:
 - clock_nanosleep (abstime, monotonic or TAI clock)
 - futex_wait ← should we? Maybe we should change to futex_pi?
 - epoll_wait

Are the above rules complete?



futex_wait

Should RV monitors warn users about **futex_wait**?

- Glibc's **pthread_mutex()** without PI uses **futex_wait** → we should warn that
- Glibc's pthread_cond_wait() also uses futex_wait → maybe we shouldn't warn
- What about other users of futex_wait?



The run-time monitors use trace points and verify that:

- Real-time tasks do not raise page faults
- RT tasks are not woken by lower-priority tasks or softirq
- A task going to sleep must mean:
 - clock_nanosleep (abstime, monotonic or TAI clock)
 - futex_wait
 - epoll_wait
 - ... something else? What about blocking read() and write()?



