A Survey on Multi-Formalism Performance Evaluation Tools

Simonetta Balsamo Gian-Luca Dei Rossi Andrea Marin

Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali, Informatica e Statistica Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia

ESM '12, Essen, 22-24 October 2012

Motivation

- Performance and reliability evaluation is useful
 - widely studied topic
 - powerful tool for system designers and maintainers
 - different formalisms and different solution techniques
- Modelling phase is difficult
 - Formalisms require a specific knowledge
 - Systems should be modelled component-wise
 - Different formalisms for different problems and kind of components
- Use of tools that support multiple formalisms and their composition.

Toy Example

- System where ${\cal N}_u$ identical users follow a strict corporate workflow
- in some of the workflow phases they request several computations to a set on ${\cal N}_s$ servers
 - parallel processing of the jobs
- The server are made of many software components which in turn use various (even shared) hardware resources
- After all the computations are completed, the users spend time to merge them, and produces an output.
- What if we want to compute some *performance indices* on this system?
 - Which formalism is better suited for this task?

What we consider and what we don't

- A survey on tools that support multiple formalisms.
- Classification criteria
 - Formalisms
 - Solutions
 - User interface
 - Documentation
 - License
 - Maintenance status
 - Supported platforms
- What we didn't analyse
 - Interoperability
 - Ease of use
 - Pricing scheme
 - . . .

What we consider and what we don't

- Wide plethora of tools for different formalism families
 - Markov Processes
 - Stochastic or Probabilistic Process Algebras
 - Queueing Networks
 - Stochastic Petri Nets
 - . . .
- We considered only tools for which we were able to verify the existence of an actual implementation
 - Active development after the year 2000
 - Multiple references in published papers
 - Website
- We identified 4 tools which satisfy the conditions: SHARPE, Möbius, SmArT, SIMTHESysEr

SHARPE

- Symbolic Hierarchical Automated Reliability and Performance Evaluator
- Developed at Duke University
- Interactive or unattended (scripted) use
- Graphical User Interface
- Formalisms: Markov and semi-Markov chains, Markov regenerative processes, Multi-Chain Product Form Queueing Network, Generalised Stochastic Petri Nets , Stochastic Reward Nets, Reliability Block Diagrams, Fault Trees, Reliability Graphs, Series-Parallel Graphs
- Numerical solutions for steady-state and transient analysis.
- Hierarchical multiformalism composition
- Books

Möbius

- Symbolic Hierarchical Automated Reliability and Performance Evaluator
- Developed at the University of Illinois
- Interactive or unattended (scripted) use
- Graphical User Interface
- Formalisms: Stochastic Activity Networks, Buckets and Balls, PEPA_k, Fault Trees
- Exact Numerical solutions (when available) and simulation.
- Distributed computation
- Flat multiformalism composition

SmArT

- Stochastic Model checking Analyzer for Reliability and Timing
- Developed at the University of California, Riverside
- Unattended (scripted) use through an ad hoc programming language
- Formalisms: Markov Chains, Stochastic Petri Nets
- Numerical solutions for steady-state and transient analysis.
- Model checking

SIMTHESysEr

- Based on the SIMTHESys approach to modelling
 - Structured Infrastructure for Multiformalism modelling and Testing of Heterogeneous formalisms and Extensions for SYStems
- Developed at 3 Italian universities
- General framework to develop new tools
- User defined classes of models and solvers
 - Pluggable interaction among modules
- Some already implemented formalisms
- Some already implemented solvers

Comparison: formalisms and solutions

- SHARPE offers the widest choice of formalisms.
 - not all formalisms can be used in a hierarchy of submodels
 - Numerical solutions
- Möbius is the only one to support PEPA.
 - All formalisms can be used in composed models
 - Numerical solutions or (distributed) simulations
- SIMTHESysEr could be extended to support arbitrary formalisms and solution methods
- SmArT offers two families of formalisms
 - numerical solutions
 - we can do model checking on them!

Comparison: user interfaces

• SHARPE and Möbius have graphical user interfaces



- SIMTHESysEr can parse models designed using Draw-Net
- SmArT can be used non-interactively through a programming language

Comparison: documentation/maintenance/license

- SHARPE
 - proprietary, free for academic users
 - actively maintained
 - well documented
- Möbius
 - proprietary, free for academic users
 - actively maintained
 - very well documented
- SmArT
 - proprietary, licensing not disclosed
 - no recent updates
 - well documented
- SIMTHESysEr
 - freely available source code
 - in ongoing development
 - less documented

Comparison

	SHARPE	Möbius	SmArT	SIMTHESysEr
Supported	Markov and	AN, Buckets	Markov	pluggable, ATM
Formalisms	Semi-Markov,	and Balls,	Chains, SPNs	Markov Chains,
	RBDs, FTs, RGs,	$PEPA_k$, Fault		QNs (limited),
	MCPFQN, GSPNs,	Trees		SPNs
	SPGs			
Solution	Numerical (Ap-	Exact Numeri-	Numerical	pluggable, ATM
Methods	proximate and	cal, Simulation		CTMC solution
	Exact)			and simulation
User Inter-	Textual, GUI	Textual, GUI	Textual	Textual
face				
Platforms	Windows (Linux	Linux, Mac-	Linux, Mac-	Windows (other
	and Solaris in older	OSX, Win-	OSX, Win-	platforms may
	versions)	dows	dows	work)
License	Proprietary, no	Proprietary, no	Not Specified	Source code
	cost for academic	cost for aca-	(on demand)	freely available
	users	demic users		
Maintenance	Supported and up-	Supported and	Not recently	In active devel-
	dated	updated	updated	opment

Conclusion

- All the analysed softwares are powerful tools for modelling complex systems
- The choice depends on the users' requirements
 - Professionals: implementation polishing, commercial support, GUIs.
 - Academics: source code availability, extendability, books
 - All users: documentation
- Single-formalism tools could be better suited for specific tasks
- The intrinsic difficulties in building multi-formalism tools limit the number of available software packages
 - Academic institutions could not have resources to maintain the code.
- Possible future works: quantitative analysis on the performances of the tools themselves.

Thanks!

Thanks for the attention any question?