Towards a Solution for Synchronizing Disparate Models of Ultra-Large-Scale Systems

James H. Hill, Jules White, Sean Eade, Douglas C. Schmidt
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN, USA
{j.hill, jules.white, sean.eade, d.schmidt}@vanderbilt.edu

Trip Denton
Lockheed Martin, Advanced Technology Lab
Cherry Hill, NJ, USA
ldenton@atl.lmco.com

ABSTRACT
Traditional model-driven engineering (MDE) techniques rely on a paradigm where systems are developed using tightly coupled, monolithic modeling tools. Such monolithic modeling tools address many concerns, but operate largely in isolation of one another. As system size and complexity grow to become ultra-large-scale (ULS) systems, it is becoming clear that no single monolithic modeling tool can capture all the concerns of an ULS system. It is therefore essential that isolated modeling tools collaborate with each other when realizing ULS systems.

This position paper presents our approach to facilitate collaboration between disparate MDE tools and their models. Our approach is based on model attributes, which are key/shared assumptions/concerns about an ULS system, extracted from a source model and used to synchronize disparate models. Our approach is suitable for ULS systems because the independent relation created between the isolated models and the model attributes enables independent trade-off analysis between models, decentralized development of models, and integration with inconsistent and rapidly changing models that are ideal for a particular domain or feature of a ULS system.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Key challenges of model-driven ULS system development.
Traditional model-driven engineering (MDE) [14] has shown great promise when building medium- to large-scale systems [1,11]. MDE helps raise the level of abstraction of system design and allows developers to express their intent and work with artifacts that are more closely related to domain constructs than third-generation programming languages. MDE also alleviates many of the inherent complexities associated with building large-scale systems, such as documenting design specifications [12], verifying functional properties [2], validating non-functional properties [6], or solving deployment & configuration (D&C) problems [15].

As systems grow larger and more complex to become ultra-large-scale (ULS) systems [7], however, a single MDE technique or tool (such as domain-specific modeling languages [10] or formal models [3]) is insufficient to provide all the required support. Different system concerns, such as its fault-tolerance capabilities, real-time schedulability, and software-to-hardware deployment topology, require different languages to precisely analyze the system [9]. It is hard to leverage conventional MDE techniques for ULS systems if (1) each modeling language or tool is used in isolation due to dependencies between models and (2) decisions in one model have unforeseen consequences in other models.

For example, an intelligent transportation system [4], as shown in Figure 1, that coordinates its operations with many intersections in a city may have a UML model of the system’s conceptual implementation (e.g., classes, sequence, and use-case diagrams), a formal model to verify functional properties (e.g., deadlock and state reachability), and a system execution model to validate non-functional properties (e.g., worst-case system execution time). Moreover, different portions of the system may be developed by different groups dispersed throughout a region, which implies different—possibly conflicting—underlying concerns and assumptions of the system under development. If system developers want to leverage a new model (such as a D&C modeling language) or implement new functionality (such as evaluating the effect of checkpointing the system’s state), it is imperative that the ULS system’s models collaborate to ensure each addresses their specific problem with...
the same underlying system assumptions and remain appropriately consistent with one another.

Maintaining consistency between models is necessary even for small-scale systems because a single model of a system is rarely sufficient to model all relevant aspects of a system. For small-scale systems it is feasible to maintain this consistency manually. Such an approach is problematic for ULS systems, however, since they are created by many developers, working in different organizations, distributed across many regions and domains, using multiple disparate MDE techniques and tools. When developers maintain consistency between these different modeling boundaries manually they often make assumptions about the ULS system to map the conceptual model to a concrete model that fits within their span of interest/responsibility.

For instance, in our intelligent transportation system example the UML model and the system execution model may have different assumptions about how checkpointing is implemented, or the formal model and system execution model may differ in their checkpointing frequency assumptions. These different assumptions also will affect how the D&C model deploys the realized ULS system. In particular, these assumptions create diverging and inconsistent solutions between models that need to collaborate to realize a working ULS system, such as the intelligent transportation system illustrated in Figure 1.

Solution approach — Model synchronization via model interfaces and attributes. To address the problem of collaboration and synchronization between models of ULS systems, developers need new techniques that will allow disparate MDE techniques and tools to communicate seamlessly when creating and deploying ULS systems. This paper describes our approach enabling synchronization between disparate models of ULS systems.

Our approach uses model attributes, which are key/shared assumptions/concerns about an ULS system, model interfaces and connectors, which are used to described and insert/extract the model attributes into/from their target/source model, respectively. Our approach also allows the seamless integration of new models (i.e., model plug-and-play) so they can collaborate with existing disparate models of the ULS system. Our initial observations show that this approach enables independent trade-off analysis between models, decentralized development of models, and integration with inconsistent and rapidly changing that are ideal for a particular domain, or feature, of a ULS system.

Paper organization. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 elaborates our approach to model synchronization for ULS systems; Section 3 describes initial results realized by our approach; Section 4 compares our approach with related work; and Section 5 presents concluding remarks and future research directions.

2. SYNCHRONIZING DISPARATE MODELS OF ULS SYSTEMS

In Section 1, we discussed the challenges of synchronizing disparate models of ULS systems. To address these challenges, a methodology is needed that allows disparate models—which can be dispersed widely throughout regions—to exchange common knowledge, such as functional (e.g., checkpointing frequency), implementation (e.g., portions of the systems affected by checkpointing implementation) and deployment (e.g., target hardware/software) requirements. Such a methodology should provide the following features:

- A database that contains a disjoint subset of model attributes, which are system properties that must be shared between multiple disparate models and stored in a well-defined format, such as a scalar value, comma-separated values, or verbose XML, of the realized ULS system. Model attributes represent the minimal information needed to ensure disparate models maintain consistent assumptions based on executing the source model, i.e., evaluating it based on its current values. Moreover, the model attributes help to prevent diverging solutions, similar to an invariant specified in formal model checking [2].
- Model interfaces, which describe the input/output model attributes for a particular model type, and model connectors, which are implementations of a model interface and understand how to read/write a subset of model attributes needed to maintain a consistent view of the ULS system. Individual models read/write the model attributes to/from their target database via model connectors. Since multiple databases may need to store a disjoint subset of the ULS system’s properties that must be shared between disparate models, model connectors are responsible for resolving the location(s) of the model attributes. Model connectors are also bound to a particular model type to promote reuse across multiple domains and solutions.
- Generic and extensible plug-and-play support for modeling languages and tools that is not bound to a particular format, language, or specification. As the ULS system evolves, new/different models will be added to their current design space. Such models will also begin to read/write their own model attributes. A plug-and-play framework enables support of future and unknown modeling languages because they only have to describe their model interface and provide a model connector to begin read/writing model attributes. By make the plug-and-play framework extensible, different modeling tools and languages can be used to specialize the existing infrastructure without breaking it. For example, a new modeling tool integrated into the framework may specialize it to validate the value of an attribute using a XML schema definition without requiring the other modeling tools and languages to implement the same functionality.

Our solution approach is shown in Figure 2. All model attributes

![Figure 2: Conceptual Overview of ULS System Model Synchronization](image-url)

(1) are stored in well-defined location(s), such as a database or repository. Due the scale of the system, it is possible to replicate attribute database(s) as shown in Figure 2 so models use an appropriate database, e.g., one closest to their location. Each attribute
database contains a disjoint subset of properties, such as properties for a specific version, concern, or feature, of the ULS system under development. When developers need to update their model (2) they use the model’s corresponding connector to read the appropriate model attributes, which ensures the local working copy of the model makes assumptions consistent with those of other models.

Figure 2 also shows that model connector’s write model attributes back to the attribute database. After developers finish updating the local working copy of their model, e.g., evaluating their model based on the new/updated ULS system assumptions, they use the model connector (3) to write their model attributes back to the appropriate (replicated) database. Although this process could take some time to converge due to ULS system scale, it ensures that all models continue to maintain a consistent view of the ULS system consistent with the changes made.

3. INITIAL OBSERVATIONS OF MODEL SYNCHRONIZATION

Section 2 described our solution approach to enable disparate models to coordinate with one another in ULS systems. This section presents some initial observations of using model attributes and connectors to facilitate model synchronization.

Support for loose coupling of modeling tools/environments/languages. Model attributes are pushed/pulled to/from the model, respectively, via model connectors. Since model connectors are responsible for handling model attributes, the actual models (i.e., those within a developers local workspace) are not concerned with the format of the actual model attribute. This approach creates a loose coupling between disparate modeling tools/environments/languages, such as those illustrated in Figure 3, and allows them to remain independent from each other—similar to how the Bridge and Adapter pattern [5] allow two unrelated objects to collaborate without becoming tightly coupled.

Due to the loose coupling, the disparate models can collaborate without becoming tightly coupled to other models. Moreover, we can integrate (i.e., plug-and-play) new tools/environments/languages that address specific concerns of the ULS system as needed, such as the D&C modeling language for the intelligent transportation system shown in Figure 3, without breaking existing models of the ULS system.

Trade-off analysis of ULS system properties. Model attributes are assumptions about the ULS system’s properties between multiple disparate models. Before system developers use one or more models, they must be updated with the latest properties from the multiple disparate models. Before system developers use one or more models, they must be updated with the latest properties from the multiple disparate models. Before system developers use one or more models, they must be updated with the latest properties from the multiple disparate models. Before system developers use one or more models, they must be updated with the latest properties from the multiple disparate models.

Prior work on model synchronization. Prior work on model synchronization has largely focused on small-scale systems where a single model or tool is sufficient. Since ULS systems do not fit this single model/tool mold, we do not compare with these existing monolithic modeling techniques.

Zave et. al [16] describe techniques for collaborating between disparate models in the domain of formal specification and verification of programs. Their solution mapped all models to a common simplified predicate logic—similar to the MetaObject Facility for domain-specific modeling languages. Although this approach...
is valid, it means all disparate models have complete knowledge of the entire program, which is not feasible for ULS system models because they span many domains. Our approach differs from Zave et. al because we do not map the model attributes to a common representation. Mapping model attributes to a common representation is particularly hard when disparate models of ULS systems have overlapping concerns, but disjoint semantics, purposes, and underlying formalisms. Moreover, our approach alleviates the need for disparate models to have complete knowledge of the system and focuses on attributes (or assumptions) that are necessary for it to solve its problem.

The (Web-based) Open Tool Integration Framework (OTIF) is a tool that provides collaboration between disparate models. OTIF’s uses graph transformations and rewriting techniques to transform models between isolated tools, which is more of a point-to-point solution. Our solution approach is different in that we do not perform model transformations and rewriting techniques to achieve model synchronization. Instead, we make model attributes, which are common assumptions about the system, the primary artifacts for synchronizing disparate models. Moreover, OTIF’s solution implies that models have a complete view of the system and are tightly coupled; whereas, our solution approach implies that models have a partial view of the system, i.e., the minimal knowledge necessary to synchronize disparate models, and are loosely coupled.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS
As ULS systems become more prevalent, multiple models will be needed to express different system design concerns. To ensure that each model has a consistent view of the system’s assumptions, disparate models will need to exchange information. This paper described our solution approach to enable disparate models to collaborate, which is based on storing common assumptions about the system in model attributes and using model interfaces and connectors to manage model attributes for individual models. Our initial results indicate that this approach enables disparate models to collaborate without needing complete knowledge of the entire system.

The following list summarizes our future research directions for enabling model synchronization between disparate models in ULS systems:

- Automatically maintaining consistency between models should ideally occur continuously throughout the development lifecycle of the system. Our future work therefore involves understanding the benefits of using continuous integration environments to enable the continuous model integration.
- When synchronizing many disparate models there will be times when different models will have conflicting results or assumptions based on the evaluation of their subset of model attributes. Our future work therefore involves understanding how to locate such problems and how to resolve them both autonomously and manually.
- There can be use cases where the dependencies between model attributes form a cyclic graph, such as a feedback loop between two models. Our future work therefore includes understanding how to handle such use cases to prevent the synchronization process from entering infinite loops.
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