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Publish-Subscribe Systems

- **The Problem:**
  - Publish-subscribe systems are ubiquitous
    - CORBA, JMS, Visual Basic, MVC, ...
  - But we don’t have good ways to express properties or to reason about their satisfaction

- **Approach:**
  - **Logical framework** for reasoning about pub-sub systems
    - Rely-guarantee approach
    - Temporal logic used for property specifications
  - **Model checking** tool tailored to pub-sub systems
    - built-in checks for common properties
    - tailorable to specific variant of pub-sub infrastructure
Publish-Subscribe Model

- **Components**
  - Have local state and methods
  - Announce (publish) events
  - Register for (subscribe to) events by indicating a method to be invoked when event is announced

- **Events**
  - The unit of communication between components
  - May carry additional information as parameters

- **Event Connector (Dispatcher)**
  - Maintains event-method registrations
  - Invokes registered methods when an event is announced
Example: Set and Counter

Set
Methods: add/delete
S = {a, b, c}

Event/Method Registration
EvAdd       : Set.add
EvDel       : Set.delete
EvAdded     : Counter.increase
EvDeleted   : Counter.decrease

Counter
Methods: increase/decrease
C = 3

Event Connector

EvAdd(n)  EvDel(n)

Environment

Establish the invariant |S| = C
Advantages

- Loosely coupled components
  - A component that announces an event does not know (and does not need to know) the consequence of announcement

- Improves system maintainability
  - Easy to add and remove components
  - Easy to modify individual components
Disadvantages

- Lots of inherent non-determinism
  - Order of events to deliver
  - Order of invocation of multiple event recipients
  - Timing of in-transit events
  - Order of completion of event handling

- Burden of correctness falls on system integrator
  - Difficult to guarantee intended system behavior
  - Difficult to choose the right event infrastructure
    - many possible dispatch policies, concurrency disciplines, synchronization schemes
Difficult Questions

- What do we want to say about such systems? What’s an “invariant” and how to check it?
- Do the components announce the events that they should announce?
- What will be the effect of announcing a particular event?
- If a new component is added, will it break what is already there?
- Can a different event infrastructure be used without causing any problem?
Possible Solution: Model-Checking

Typical model-checking process

- Elicitation
- Target System
- Abstraction
- Properties
- Model
- Model Checker
- Exhaustive Search
- Pass/Fail Result
- Counter Example (when fails)
Pros and Cons

- The Good
  - Exhaustive search over the state space
  - Counter-example generation
  - Mature theoretical foundations for reasoning

- The Bad
  - State explosion
  - Steep learning curve
  - Hard to construct a good model
  - Hard to specify properties of interest

- The Ugly
  - “Pass” does not mean that everything is all right
  - Difficult to maintain and reuse the existing model
Focus of Research

Ease the burden of constructing models and properties by providing domain-specific model-checking front end.
Approach

Target System

Component/Property Specification

Infrastructure Configuration

Model Generator

Generated Model

Model Checker

Reusable Model

“Natural” specification
Innovative Features

- Automatic model generation of the pub-sub communication infrastructure
  - Reduces the cost of constructing models for publish-subscribe systems
  - Reduces model errors
- Parameterized communication infrastructure
  - Allows easy exploration of alternatives
- User-friendly component/property specification
  - Eases specification of component behavior
Reusable Infrastructure Model

Environment (external event source)

Delivery Policy

Dispatcher

Interface

Comp 1

\[\ldots\]

Interface

Comp N

Shared state
Infrastructure Design Space

- Announcement options
  - Asynchronous: immediate return from announcement
  - Synchronous: wait for complete event handling
- Dispatch order
  - FCFS, Random, Prioritized
- Delivery options
  - Guaranteed, Lossy
- Startup
  - Synchronous, Random
- Concurrency options
  - Single thread of control
  - Separate threads of control
    - Single thread per component
    - Multiple threads per component
      - Concurrent invocation of different methods
      - Concurrent invocation of any method
Initial Results

- Experimented with several systems
  - Toy examples, such as set-counter
  - Distributed resource management
- Reduced effort for model generation
  - Typical reduction: 80% of the model automatically generated, although depends on number and size of components
  - E.g., for set-counter 147/184 lines
Limitations

- Component specification in XML
- Properties specified in LTL
- No support for dynamism
- No support for synchronous start up
- Subset of infrastructure options supported
- Counter examples in terms of lower-level model
Current Work

- Component specifications in stylized Java
  - More intuitive link to implementations
  - Can execute the specifications
- More complete enumeration of communication alternatives
  - Formal model of design space (Z & FSP)
- Support for dynamism
  - Add/remove components/registrations
- Support for alternative startup policies
- Retargeted to Spin
  - Better support for communication/dynamism
New Framework

Target System

Component Specification in Java

Java Code for Event Infrastructure

Java Compiler

Model Checking Framework

Infrastructure Configuration

Generated Model

Counter Example

Interpreted Counter Example

Model Checker 1

Model Checker 2

Model Checker 3

Java Code for Event Infrastructure

Java Compiler

Java Executable

Model Checking Framework

Generated Model

Counter Example

Interpreted Counter Example

Read

Generate
Component Specification: Old

```xml
<component name = "Counter">
  <local-var name = "counter" type = "-2..5"> 0 </local-var>

  <method name = "increase">
    <statement>
      <assignment var-name = "counter"> counter + 1 </assignment>
    </statement>
  </method>

  <method name = "decrease">
    <statement>
      <assignment var-name = "counter"> counter - 1 </assignment>
    </statement>
  </method>

</component>
```
Component Specification: Old

<event name = "EvAdded"/>
<event name = "EvDeleted"/>

<component-instance component-name = "Counter"
    instance-name = "theCounter"> />

<event-binding event-name = "EvAdded">
    <method-binding instance-name = "theCounter"
        method-name = "increase"/>
</event-binding>

<event-binding event-name = "EvDeleted">
    <method-binding instance-name = "theCounter"
        method-name = "decrease"/>
</event-binding>
Component Specification: New

class Example extends PubSub {

    class EvAdd extends Event { int element; }
    class EvAdded extends Event {} ...

    class Set extends Component {
        boolean[] elements = new boolean[MAX_ELEMENT];

        void add (EvAdd ev) {
            if (element[ev.element] == false) {
                element[ev.element] = true;
                announce ("Added");
            }
        }
    ...

    Example () {
        int cid;
        cid = create("Set");
        subscribe("EvAdd", "add", cid);
        ...
    }
}
Generated SPIN Model

```
Generated SPIN Model

proctype Counter (chan register, subscribe, control) {
  byte counter;
  chan announce_req = [1] of {mtype, attr};
  chan announce_ack = [1] of {int};
  chan receive_req = [1] of {int, mtype, attr};
  chan receive_ack = [1] of {int};
  mtype event;
  attr param;

  inline Counter_proc_increase () {
    counter ++;
    receive_ack!param.eid;
  }

  inline Counter_proc_decrease () {
    counter --;
    receive_ack!param.eid;
  }

  register!ps_join (_pid, announce_req, announce_ack,
      receive_req, receive_ack);

  control?ps_start;
  do
    :: receive_req?Counter_proc_increase_id(event, param)
      -> Counter_proc_increase();
    :: receive_req?Counter_proc_increase_id(event, param)
      -> Counter_proc_decrease();
  od;

  register!ps_leave (_pid, announce_req, announce_ack,
      receive_req, receive_ack);
}
```
Sample Property: Old

Check the "invariant" \(| S| = C\)

ConsiderateEnvironment :
assert (G (~disp.evtBuffOverflow & ~updateInvQueue.error));

StoppingEnvironment :
assert(F G (~announceUpdt));

CounterCatchesUp :
assert(G F (set.setSize = counter.count));

using StoppingEnvironment, ConsiderateEnvironment prove CounterCatchesUp;
Sample Property: New

Check the “invariant” $|S| = C$

```
invariant (quiescent() => Set.size = Counter.counter);
```
Implementation Techniques

- Non-determinism
  - Workaround
    ```java
    switch (random(3)) {
    case 0: /* do something */ break;
    case 1: /* do something */ break;
    case 2: /* do something */ break;
    }
    ```

- Operations for event communication
  - Reside in super classes
    ```java
    Class PubSub {
    Void subscribe (String, String, int) { ... }
    ...
    }
    ```
In-Progress

- Property specification
- Counter example explanation
- Case studies
  - NASA MDS
Other Related Work (Posters)

- Architecture-based run time adaptation
  - Formal architectural models used to monitor and repair running systems
- Formal architecture design tools
  - Enforcing constraints of a style
  - NASA MDS case study
  - Ford Motor Company MSE project
The End
On-going Work

- Better linkage to implementation
  - Stylized use of programming language for specification
  - Generates executable system as well as a checkable model
  - Counter example explanation

- Property specification primitives and templates
  - Hide the details of generated model
  - Provide many of the common sanity checks
  - Move towards push-button tools
Current Work – (cont)

- New specification capabilities
  - Dynamic component creation and binding
  - Real-time properties
Examples

Set-Counter
- Set (S) has operations insert/delete
- Counter (C) has operations inc/dec
- Establish “invariant” |S| = C

Distributed Simulation (HLA)
- Arbitrary number of simulations publish values of objects that they simulate
- Run-time infrastructure (RTI) maintains state (e.g., ownership of objects), mediates protocols of interaction
- Many invariants (e.g., each object is owned by a single simulation)
More Examples
(State-based duals)

- **Shared-variable triggered systems**
  - Aka “continuous query” systems
  - State changes trigger computations
  - Components read/write shared variables, but are otherwise independent

- **Real-time periodic tasks**
  - Tasks placed in periodically-scheduled buckets
  - Tasks consume values of certain variables; produce values of other variables
  - Tasks within bucket must complete before bucket period