

# Building Adaptable Software for Resilience

Milind Kulkarni  
CRISP Seminar, 9/27/2018



**PURDUE**  
UNIVERSITY®

# what do we mean by resilience?

- When people think **software resilience**, they often think of specific issues:
  - **Fault tolerance:** The ability to tolerate failures during application execution (hardware failure, failure of other software components, etc.)
    - Maybe the most common sense. Microsoft defines resiliency as “the ability of a system to gracefully handle and recover from failures”
  - **Security:** The ability to withstand malicious users or environment

# a broader view

**resilience**, noun: an ability to recover from  
or easily adjust to **misfortune** or **change**

# a broader view

**resilience**, noun: an ability to recover from  
or easily adjust to **misfortune** or **change**

**software resilience**, *noun*: an ability for  
software to **adapt** to **change**



# software resilience as adaptability

- Software should be able to adapt to different circumstances
  - Hardware platform not the same as expected: *failing* hardware, *removing* hardware, *adding* hardware, *changing* hardware
  - Usage scenario not the same as expected: input is *erroneous*, input is *malicious*, input is *larger* or *smaller* than expected
- **Goal:** software written one time, but can adapt to a wide variety of different scenarios

# adaptation scenarios

- Hardware availability can change dramatically due to failure

# adaptation scenarios

- Hardware availability can change dramatically due to failure





# adaptation scenarios

- Hardware availability can change dramatically due to failure





# adaptation scenarios

- **Hardware availability can change dramatically due to failure**
  - This is “normal” fault tolerance: how can software react to unexpected changes in the operating environment such as the failure of hardware
  - A wide range of techniques (too many to list)
  - But these are not the only adaptation scenarios to consider!

# parameter tuning

- **Key hardware parameters vary across systems**

# parameter tuning

- Key hardware parameters vary across systems





# parameter tuning

- Key hardware parameters vary across systems





# parameter tuning

- **Key hardware parameters vary across systems**
  - Same architecture, but different specific properties (more cores, less memory, etc.)
  - Often can be handled by changing parameters in software (number of threads, parameters that govern cache usage, etc.)
    - Basic algorithms/implementations usually do not change
  - Often done at compile time or install time (hardware parameters like this do not usually change at run time)
    - Not always possible — some scenarios require different parameters for different inputs, so you need to change at runtime
- **One challenge:** how do you determine what to set a parameter to?

# parameter tuning

- **Key hardware parameters vary across systems**

- Same architecture, but different specific properties (more cores, less memory, etc.)
- Often c so its working set fits in cache. The tile size must be tuned for f threads, param different cache sizes
  - Bas
- Often c is the equivalent of tiling but for recursive tree programs. Tuning his do not usually happens at runtime because “tile size” is input dependent
  - Not always possible — some scenarios require different parameters for different inputs, so you need to change at runtime

**Loop tiling** is a classic compiler technique to restructure a loop

so its working set fits in cache. The tile size must be tuned for

**Point blocking** [Jo and Kulkarni 2011, 2012; Weijiang et al. 2015]

is the equivalent of tiling but for recursive tree programs. Tuning his do not usually happens at runtime because “tile size” is input dependent



# novel architectures

- Hardware platforms often change dramatically

# novel architectures

- Hardware platforms often change dramatically



# novel architectures

- Hardware platforms often change dramatically





# novel architectures

- Hardware platforms often change dramatically



# novel architectures

- **Hardware platforms often change dramatically**
  - Software that is written for one set of assumptions that hold true for one type of hardware may not hold true for a different type of hardware
  - Modern GPUs allow programmers to easily write parallel programs
    - But simply porting over programs that worked well on CPUs does not work — GPUs have different execution models that must be managed to get good performance
  - Most work is compile-time or even earlier: compilers restructure code to work well on GPUs, or programmers use different design principles to write GPU code
  - **One challenge:** how can programmers make as few changes to their code as possible to have high performance GPUs

# novel architectures

- **Hardware platforms often change dramatically**
  - Software that is written for one set of assumptions that hold true for one type of hardware may not hold true for a different type of hardware
  - Modern *irregular* programs (that have unpredictable control and data behavior) to GPUs effectively [Jo and Kulkarni, 2013; Goldfarb and Kulkarni 2013; Ren et al 2015; Liu et al 2016; Ren et al 2017] not work —  
GPU performance is not good
  - But GPU performance is not good
  - We have also looked at targeting distributed memory machines in the same way [Hegde et al 2017a, b] to work well on GPUs, or programmers use different design principles to write GPU code
  - **One challenge:** how can programmers make as few changes to their code as possible to have high performance GPUs



# elasticity

- Hardware resources change at runtime in a planned way

# elasticity

- Hardware resources change at runtime in a planned way



# elasticity

- Hardware resources change at runtime in a planned way



# elasticity

- Hardware resources change at runtime in a planned way



# elasticity

- **Hardware resources change at runtime in a planned way**
  - Hardware resources get added or removed at runtime in response to, e.g., changing demand (think: cloud computing)
    - Key difference from fault tolerance: hardware change is planned
  - Software must be designed to dynamically adapt to different hardware resources
    - Should *take advantage* of those resources (performance should be proportional to resources)
    - Should happen without interruption/disruption of software behavior (i.e., without restarting software)
- **One challenge:** how can we write software so programmers do not have to consider the challenges of implementing elasticity



# elasticity

- **Hardware resources change at runtime in a planned way**
  - Hardware resources get added or removed at runtime in response to, e.g., changing demand (think: cloud computing)
  - Key provide programming models for *transparent elasticity*: programmers write *inelastic* software that does not consider dynamically changing hardware, and a runtime system transparently provides elasticity.
  - Software resources
  - Should properly
  - Should (i.e., without restarting software)
- **One challenge:** how can we write software so programmers do not have to consider the challenges of implementing elasticity

# input scaling

- Unexpected (but normal) inputs may lead to unexpected outcomes

# input scaling

- Unexpected (but normal) inputs may lead to unexpected outcomes





# input scaling

- Unexpected (but normal) inputs may lead to unexpected outcomes





# input scaling

- **Unexpected (but normal) inputs may lead to unexpected outcomes**
  - Handling “out of the ordinary” inputs is part of the security problem, but what about inputs that a developer did not expect?
    - e.g., inputs much larger than expected?
  - If a developer has not tested against that kind of input, program may not do what they expect
    - Does a program still perform adequately? Does the program even run correctly at all?
  - **One challenge:** how do you know whether a program is behaving “incorrectly” when presented with an unexpected input?

# input scaling

- **Unexpected (but normal) inputs may lead to unexpected outcomes**
  - Handling “out of the ordinary” inputs is part of the security problem, but what about inputs that a developer did not expect?
    - e.g. **Vrisha** [Zhou et al, 2011], **Abhranta** [Zhou et al, 2013], and **WuKong** [Zhou et al, 2015] use machine learning to build models of program behavior as a function of input scale, and then use these models to determine if a program is behaving abnormally at large scales
    - Does a program still perform adequately? Does the program even run correctly at all?
  - **One challenge:** how do you know whether a program is behaving “incorrectly” when presented with an unexpected input?

# many dimensions to adaptability

- **Design principle or (semi) automatic technique?**
- When should software adapt?
  - Compile time vs. start up time vs. continuous
- How do we introduce adaptability?
  - Manual vs. compiler-driven vs. run-time