



Semi-formal models to support program development: autonomic management within component based parallel and distributed programming

Marco Danelutto Dept. Computer Science - Univ. Pisa & CoreGRID Programming model Institute



FMCO 2008 Sophia Antipolis - October 2008





Contents

- Introduction
 - Functional vs. non-functional concerns
 - Autonomic management of non-functional concerns
- "Semi-formal" handling of non-functional concerns
 - ORC
- Use case
 - Performance tuning in stream parallel component compositions
- Conclusions





Contents

- Introduction
 - Functional vs. non-functional concerns
 - Autonomic management of non-functional concerns
- "Semi-formal" handling of non-functional concerns
 - ORC
- Use case
 - Performance tuning in stream parallel component compositions
- Conclusions





Functional & non functional concerns

- Functional
 - all aspects related to what is computed
- Non-functional
 - all aspects related to how the result is computed
- In parallel distributed programming
 - functional: the algorithm, the kind of parallel pattern used
 - non-functional: parallelism degree, load balance, fault tolerance, security, ...





Functional & non functional concerns

Functional

Application

programmer concerns

- all aspects related to what is computed
- Non-functional
 - all aspects related to how the result is computed
- In parallel distributed programming
 - functional: the algorithm, the kind of parallel pattern used
 - non-functional: parallelism degree, load balance, fault tolerance, security, ...





Functional & non functional concerns

Functional

Application

System programmer concerns

programmer concerns

- all aspects related to what is computed
- Non-functional
 - all aspects related to how the result is computed
- In parallel distributed programming
 - functional: the algorithm, the kind of parallel pattern used
 - non-functional: parallelism degree, load balance, fault tolerance, security, ...



Autonomic management of non functional concerns

- Autonomic management
 - control loop: monitor → analyze → plan → execute
 - o monitoring
 - mechanisms
 - o analyzing
 - reference models
 - o planning
 - strategies
 - executing
 - mechanisms



Autonomic management of non functional concerns

- Autonomic management
 - control loop: monitor → analyze → plan → execute
 - Abstract o monitoring performance model mechanisms Analyse Add worker. o analyzing migrate to faster PE, ... reference models **Monitor** Plan o planning strategies Monitoring mechanisms Execute executing 0 mechanisms Actuator mechanisms (deploy, run, ...)





Reactive autonomic management

- Monitoring
 - non-invasive, immediate, effective
- Analysis
 - automatic, prioritized, extendible
- Planning
 - target architecture specific, optimized
- Execute

• efficient, fast





Autonomic management in GCM

Behavioural skeleton concept

- co-design of
 - parallelism exploitation pattern
 - autonomic management
- Performance management
 - initial setup (parallelism degree)
 - optimization/tuning (load balancing, fault tolerance)
 - user driven (contract/SLA)





Autonomic management in GCM

Behavioural skeleton concept

- co-design of
 - parallelism exploitation pattern
 - autonomic management
- Performance management
 - initial setup (parallelism degree)
 - optimization/tuning (load balancing, fault tolerance)
 - user driven (contract/SLA)







Behavioural skeleton







Behavioural skeleton





Behavioural skeleton sample: functional replication







Rule based autonomic management

- triggering of actions
 - first order logic formulae over monitoring figures
- analysis
 - ordering / scheduling of the fired triggers
- planning/execute
 - sequence of mechanism invocation
- GCM uses JBoss rules (drools)
 - rulename salience nn when ... then ...





Already implemented (single pattern/ manager)

- parallelism degree adjustment
 - increase
 - suitable input pressure & unsatisfied contract
 - decrease
 - over satisfied contract
 - unsuitable input pressure
- fault tolerance
 - automatic recovery of faulty resources (muskel)



To be implemented (hierarchical pattern/ manager)

2

- change in (nesting of) parallelism exploitation patterns used
 - pipeline stage unbalance
 - stage collapsing
 - farm out stage
 - combination of collapsing and farming out



2

S3;S4

2

To be implemented (hierarchical pattern/ manager)

2

- change in (nesting of) parallelism exploitation patterns used
 - pipeline stage unbalance
 - stage collapsing
 - farm out stage
 - combination of collapsing and farming out



2

S3;S4

2

To be implemented (hierarchical pattern/ manager)

2

- change in (nesting of) parallelism exploitation patterns used
 - pipeline stage unbalance
 - stage collapsing
 - farm out stage
 - combination of collapsing and farming out



2

S3;S4

2

To be implemented (hierarchical pattern/ manager)

2

S1

- change in (nesting of) parallelism exploitation patterns used
 - pipeline stage unbalance
 - stage collapsing
 - farm out stage
 - combination of collapsing and farming out



Autonomic performance management @ work

Core GRID







Contents

- Introduction
 - Functional vs. non-functional concerns
 - Autonomic management of non-functional concerns
- "Semi-formal" handling of non-functional concerns
 ORC
- Use case
 - Performance tuning in stream parallel component compositions
- Conclusions



Tools to support reasoning about autonomic management

- the two extremes
 - formal tools

Core GRID

- consistent background needed
- nice results demonstrated
 - possibly with limited scope
- implementation
 - consistent background & ability needed
 - nice results "demonstrated"
 - possibly requiring a huge amount of time





Semi-formal tools

- preserve part of the knowledge typical of programmers
- preserve part of the techniques typical of formal tools
- e.g.
 - o a framework
 - suitable to model interesting properties of a (distributed/parallel) program
 - synthetic
 - supporting program transformations





Orc Language Project

Home

Download

Documentation

Research

Community

Orc is ...

A novel language for distributed and concurrent programming. Orc provides uniform access to computational services, including distributed communication and data manipulation, through *sites*. Using three simple concurrency primitives, the programmer *orchestrates* the invocation of sites to achieve a goal, while managing timeouts, priorities, and failures.

- Introduced by Misra and Cook in early '00
- provides primitive combinators for parallelism and non determinism (asymmetric parallelism)
- Iook&feel close to a programming language

What is it for?

- Concurrent and distributed programming
- Workflows (business process automation)
- Discrete event simulation
- Web service mashups





ORC in a slide

- site : local or remote (unreliable) unit of computation
- combinators
 - a | b site or expression a and b evaluated in parallel
 - a >> b (or a > x > b) a evaluated first, then b
 - f(x) where x:∈ (a | b) a,b and f started, as soon as either a or b produce a value, it is bound to x and (a | b) is terminated (new syntax f(x)<x<(a | b))
- Functions
 - def f(param) =
- predefined sites + channels
 - if, Rtimer, +, -, ... , ch.get(), ch.put(x)

M. Danelutto, Semi-formal models to support program development: autonomic management within component based parallel and distributed programming, *FMCO 2008, Sophia Antipolis, October 22nd, 2008*

most/all the abstractions needed are there





Sample usage of ORC

Reverse engineering (modelling) of muskel, a full Java/RMI skeleton library maintained at University of

Pisa

```
system(pgm, tasks, contract, G, t) \triangleq
      taskpool.add(tasks) \mid discovery(G, pgm, t) \mid manager(pgm, contract, t)
discovery(G, pgm, t) \triangleq (|_{g \in G} \text{ (if } remw \neq \mathsf{false} \gg rworkerpool.add(remw))
                                   where remw :\in
                                      (q.can_execute(pqm) | Rtimer(t) \gg let(false))
                          ) \gg discovery(G, pqm, t)
manager(pgm, contract, t) \triangleq
  |i:1 \le i \le contract: (rworkerpool.get > remw > ctrlthread_i(pgm, remw, t))
   monitor
ctrlthread_i(pqm, remw, t) \triangleq taskpool.get > tk >
  (if valid \gg resultpool.add(r) \gg ctrlthread<sub>i</sub>(pqm, remw, t)
    if \neg valid \gg (taskpool.add(tk))
                      alarm.put(i) \gg c_i.get > w > ctrlthread_i(pgm, w, t)
    where (valid, r) :\in
       (remw(pgm,tk) > r > let(true,r) | Rtimer(t) \gg let(false,0))
monitor \triangleq alarm.get > i > rworkerpool.get > remw > c_i.put(remw)
            \gg monitor
```





Sample usage of ORC

Reverse engineering (modelling) of muskel, a full Java/RMI skeleton library maintained at University of

Pisa

 $system(pgm, tasks, contract, G, t) \triangleq$ $taskpool.add(task's) \mid discovery(G, pgm, t) \mid manager(pgm, contract, t)$ $discovery(G, pgm, t) \triangleq (|_{g \in G} \text{ (if } remw \neq \mathsf{false} \gg rworkerpool.add(remw))$ where $remw :\in$ $(q.can_execute(pqm) \mid Rtimer(t) \gg let(false))$ $) \gg discovery(G, pqm, t)$ $manager(pgm, contract, t) \triangleq$ $|i:1 \le i \le contract: (rworkerpool.get > remw > ctrlthread_i(pgm, remw, t))$ monitor $ctrlthread_i(pqm, remw, t) \triangleq taskpool.get > tk >$ (if valid \gg resultpool.add(r) \gg ctrlthread_i(pqm, remw, t) if $\neg valid \gg (taskpool.add(tk))$ $alarm.put(i) \gg c_i.get > w > ctrlthread_i(pgm, w, t)$ where $(valid, r) :\in$ $(remw(pgm,tk) > r > let(true,r) | Rtimer(t) \gg let(false,0))$ $monitor \triangleq alarm.get > i > rworkerpool.get > remw > c_i.put(remw)$ \gg monitor





Sample usage of ORC

Reverse engineering (modelling) of muskel, a full Java/RMI skeleton library maintained at University of

Pisa

 $system(pgm, tasks, contract, G, t) \triangleq$ $taskpool.add(task's) \mid discovery(G, pgm, t) \mid manager(pgm, contract, t)$ $discovery(G, pgm, t) \triangleq (|_{g \in G} \text{ (if } remw \neq \mathsf{false} \gg rworkerpool.add(remw))$ where $remw :\in$ $(q.can_execute(pqm) \mid Rtimer(t) \gg let(false))$ $) \gg discovery(G, pgm, t)$ $manager(pgm, contract, t) \triangleq$ $|i:1 \leq i \leq contract: (rworkerpool.get > remw > ctrlthread_i(pgm, remw, t))$ monitor $ctrlthread_i(pqm, remw, t) \triangleq taskpool.get > tk >$ (if valid \gg resultpool.add(r) \gg ctrlthread_i(pqm, remw, t) if $\neg valid \gg (taskpool.add(tk))$ $alarm.put(i) \gg c_i.get > w > ctrlthread_i(pgm, w, t)$ monitoring where $(valid, r) :\in$ $(remw(pgm,tk) > r > let(true,r) | Rtimer(t) \gg let(false,0))$ $monitor \triangleq alarm.get > i > rworkerpool.get > remw > c_i.put(remw)$ \gg monitor





Sample usage of ORC

Reverse engineering (modelling) of muskel, a full Java/RMI skeleton library maintained at University of

Pisa

 $system(pgm, tasks, contract, G, t) \triangleq$ $taskpool.add(task's) \mid discovery(G, pgm, t) \mid manager(pgm, contract, t)$ $discovery(G, pgm, t) \triangleq (|_{g \in G} \text{ (if } remw \neq false \gg rworkerpool.add(remw))}$ where $remw :\in$ triggering $(g.can_execute(pgm) | Rtimer(t) \gg let(false))$ $) \gg discovery(G, pqm, t)$ $manager(pgm, contract, t) \triangleq$ $|i:1 \leq i \leq contract: (rworkerpool.get > remw > ctrlthread_i(pgm, remw, t))$ monitor $ctrlthread_i(pqm, remw, t) \triangleq taskpool.get > tk > 1$ (if valid $\gg resultpool.add(r) \gg ctrlthread_i(pgm, remw, t)$ if $\neg valid \gg (taskpool.add(tk))$ $alarm.put(i) \gg c_i.get > w > ctrlthread_i(pgm, w, t)$ monitoring where $(valid, r) :\in$ $(remw(pgm,tk) > r > let(true,r) | Rtimer(t) \gg let(false,0))$ $monitor \triangleq alarm.get > i > rworkerpool.get > remw > c_i.put(remw)$ \gg monitor





Sample usage of ORC

Reverse engineering (modelling) of muskel, a full Java/RMI skeleton library maintained at University of









Contents

- Introduction
 - Functional vs. non-functional concerns
 - Autonomic management of non-functional concerns
- "Semi-formal" handling of non-functional concerns
 - ORC
- Use case
 - Performance tuning in stream parallel component compositions
- Conclusions





ORC for autonomic management

- semi formal derivation / proof of rewriting rules
- e.g. pipe(f,g) = pipe(farm(f),g)
 - simple example, technique to be used for more complex derivations

- first step: formalization of skeletons
- second step: semi formal processing of ORC expressions





Formalization of skeletons

 $pipe(A, B, ch_{in}, ch_{out}) = stage$

 $stage(A, ch_{in}, ch_{out})$

- stage (A, ch_{in}, ch_{new}) | stage (B, ch_{new}, ch_{out})
- $\begin{array}{l} ch_{in}.get() > task > A(task) > \\ result > ch_{out}.put(result) >> \\ \texttt{stage}(A, ch_{in}, ch_{out}) \end{array}$

 $farm(W, nw, c_{in}, ch_{out})$

 $| i = 1, nw : Worker_i(W, c_{in}, ch_{out})$

 $Worker(W, c_{in}, ch_{out})$

 $= ch_{in}.get() > task > W(task) >$ $result > ch_{out}.put(result) >>$ $Worker(W, c_{in}, ch_{out})$





Semi-formal processing of ORC expressions

e.g. exploit semantics for channels

- matching get/put pair collapsing
- in actual traces
- (R free for x !)

 $(a > x > ch.put(x) > R) \mid (\ldots >> ch.get() > y > S)$

 $R \mid \ldots >> a > y > S$





 $\mathsf{pipe}(A, B, c_1, c_3) = \mathsf{stage}(A, c_1, c_2) \mid \mathsf{stage}(B, c_2, c_3)$

 $\mathsf{seq}(A, B, ch_{in}, ch_{out}) = c_{in}.get() > x > A(x) > y > B(y) > z > ch_{out}.put(z)$







- $\mathsf{pipe}(A, B, c_1, c_3) = \mathsf{stage}(A, c_1, c_2) \mid \mathsf{stage}(B, c_2, c_3)$
- $seq(A, B, ch_{in}, ch_{out}) = c_{in}.get() > x > A(x) > y > B(y) > z > ch_{out}.put(z)$
- $c_1.get() > t > A(t) > y > c_2.put(y) >> stage(A, c_1, c_2)$





$$\begin{split} \mathsf{pipe}(A,B,c_1,c_3) &= \mathsf{stage}(A,c_1,c_2) \mid \mathsf{stage}(B,c_2,c_3) \\ &= \mathsf{seq}(A,B,ch_{in},ch_{out}) \stackrel{'}{=} c_{in}.get() > x \stackrel{'}{>} A(x) > y > B(y) > z > ch_{out}.put(z) \\ \stackrel{'}{\sim} c_1.get() > t > A(t) \stackrel{'}{>} y > c_2.put(y) >> \mathsf{stage}(A,c_1,c_2) \\ &= c_2.get() > t > B(t) \stackrel{'}{>} y > c_3.put(y) >> \mathsf{stage}(B,c_2,c_3) \end{split}$$





- $\mathsf{pipe}(A, B, c_1, c_3) = \mathsf{stage}(A, c_1, c_2) \mid \mathsf{stage}(B, c_2, c_3)$
- $\mathsf{seq}(A, B, ch_{in}, ch_{out}) = c_{in}.get() > x > A(x) > y > B(y) > z > ch_{out}.put(z)$
- $c_1.get() > t > A(t) > y > c_2.put(y) >> stage(A, c_1, c_2)$
 - $c_2.get() > t > B(t) \stackrel{*}{>} y > c_3.put(y) >> \mathsf{stage}(B, c_2, c_3)$





 $\mathsf{pipe}(A, B, c_1, c_3) = \mathsf{stage}(A, c_1, c_2) \mid \mathsf{stage}(B, c_2, c_3)$

 $\mathsf{seq}(A,B,ch_{in},ch_{out}) = c_{in}.get() > x > A(x) > y > B(y) > z > ch_{out}.put(z)$

 $c_1.get() > t > A(t) > y > c_2.put(y) >> stage(A, c_1, c_2)$

 $c_2.get() > t > B(t) > y > c_3.put(y) >> stage(B, c_2, c_3)$

 $c_1.get() > x > \mathsf{stage}(seq(A,B))(x) > y > c_3.put(y)$





 $\mathsf{pipe}(A, B, c_1, c_3) = \mathsf{stage}(A, c_1, c_2) \mid \mathsf{stage}(B, c_2, c_3)$

 $\mathsf{seq}(A,B,ch_{in},ch_{out}) = c_{in}.get() > x > A(x) > y > B(y) > z > ch_{out}.put(z)$

 $c_1.get() > t > A(t) > y > c_2.put(y) >> stage(A, c_1, c_2)$

 $c_2.get() > t > B(t) > y > c_3.put(y) >> stage(B, c_2, c_3)$

 $c_1.get() > x > \mathsf{stage}(seq(A, B))(x) > y > c_3.put(y)$

$\mathsf{pipe}(A, B, ch_{in}, ch_{out}) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{seq}(A, B, ch_{in}, ch_{out})$





Design of autonomic managers

$\mathsf{BSekl}(Sk, Mgr, SLA) = Sk \mid Mgr(Sk, SLA)$

$$\begin{split} Mgr(Sk,SLA) = & distribute(Sk,SLA) > s > \\ & monitor(s) > m > \\ & analyse(s,m) > (b,p,v) > \\ & ((if(b) >> adapt(s,p) > s1 > \\ & Mgr(s1,SLA)) \\ & | (if(\sim b) >> raise(v) > \\ & Mgr(s,passiveMode(SLA))) \end{split}$$





Design of autonomic managers

$BSekl(Sk, Mgr, SLA) = Sk \mid Mgr(Sk, SLA)$
Mqr(Sk, SLA) = distributical management of autonomic of All stributical management of All stri
$\frac{m_{Owards hierarchie}}{m_{Owards merarchie}} > m > m > (b, p, v) > (b, p, $
$\underset{\text{Marco Danelutto, Peter Press}{\text{Marco Danelutto, Peter Press}}{\text{Marco Danelutto, Peter Press}} (if(b) >> adapt(s, p) > s1 > Mar(s1 SLA))$
$\begin{array}{ll} & \underset{\text{case study, Euromicro}}{\text{Marco Aldinuccli omicro}} & (if(\sim b) > raise(v) > \\ & & Mgr(s, passiveMode(SLA)) \end{array}$





Adaptation in BS

 $\begin{array}{l} adapt(\mathsf{pipe}(A,pipe(B,C)),plan) = \\ (if(plan = collapseFirst) >> \mathsf{pipe}(\mathsf{seq}(A,B),C)) \\ \mid (if(plan == collapseLast) >> \mathsf{pipe}(A,\mathsf{seq}(B,C))) \\ \mid (if(plan == farmoutFirst) >> \mathsf{pipe}(\mathsf{farm}(A),\mathsf{pipe}(B,C)))) \end{array}$

modelling of management before actual implementation





Adding metadata

- annotations on Orc code
 - modelling several non functional concerns
 - e.g. security, communication costs

formal process deriving the aggregated metadata from primitive/elementary/ground one (synthesis) or primitive metadata from aggregated (analysis)





Sample metadata: process placement

Analysis

- placement annotations
- policy managing nested skeleton annotations

 $\frac{placement(\mathsf{pipe}(A,B),loc(X)) \land distribPolicy(keep)}{placement(A,loc(X)) \land placement(B,loc(X))}$

 $\frac{placement(\mathsf{pipe}(A,B),loc(X)) \ \land \ distribPolicy(distrib)}{placement(A,loc(fresh())) \ \land \ placement(B,loc(fresh()))}$





Sample metadata usage

- skeleton program + placement metadata (includes support: channels, manager process(es), ...)
- communication cost

 $\frac{placement(ch.get(), loc(X) \land placement(ch, loc(Y))}{nonLocalCost(ch.get())}$

 $\frac{placement(ch.get(), loc(X) \land placement(ch, loc(Y) \\ nonLocalCost(ch.get())$

automatic derivation of communication cost in typical traces of execution





Sample metadata usage

- Marco Aldinucci, Marco Danelutto and Peter Kilpatrick, A framework for Prototyping and reasoning about grid systems, in: Parallel Computing: Architectures, Algorithms and Applications (Proc. of TPARCO 2007); Julich Marco Aldinucci, Marco Danelutto and Peter Kilpatrick, A framework for prototyping and reasoning about grid systems, in: Parallel Computing: Architectures, Algorithms and Applications (Proc. of {PARCO 2007}, Jüich, Germany), John von Neumann Institute for Computing, 2007

systems, in: rarailer computing: Architectures, Aigoriung, 2007 Germany), John von Neumann Institute for Computing

automatic derivation of communication cost in typical traces of execution





Sample metadata: security

Synthesis

 $\frac{placement(A, loc(X)) \land insecure(X)}{insecure(\mathsf{pipe}(A, _)) \ insecure(\mathsf{pipe}(_, A))}$

- marking of root depending on the marks at leaves
- Usage:
 - node marking => securing code and data only when needed





An Orc based development framework







O2J internals (abstract view)







O2J internals (2)







Experimental results



Aldinucci, Danelutto, Dazzi, Kilpatrick, From ORC models to distributed Java code, CoreGRID IW'08 Herklion, April, 2-5, 2008





Experimental results







Conclusions

- Autonomic management of non functional features
 - o a must
 - a complex task
- Semi formal modelling
 - provides insights and design hints
 - can be used to support reasoning
 - event stronger with proper metadata
- Experience in GCM / CoreGRID / GridCOMP





Thank you for your attention Any questions ?