Special Interest Group: Palladio Simulation Core

Palladio Days 2010

Jörg Henß | November 25, 2010
Why a Core Model?

- Reuse of models in several tools
  - Don’t reinvent the wheel
  - Knowledge transfer
  - Eases concurrent development
- High degree of abstraction
  - Custom extensions can only be decorated
  - Core meant to be stable
Disambiguation - Core

- Core already used in different contexts
  - Intermediate Core: Interface to different prediction models
  - Advanced Model + Quality Decorator - PCM today + Decorator
  - Basic Core: Structure and Communication

- Core Model presented targeted at performance simulation
  - Model not intended to be modeled by “hand”
  - Intermediate model \( \rightarrow \) target of transformations

Idea for better Naming

- Minimal Set of Constructs that Are Behaviour Equivalent to the RDSEFF: MiSCABE
- Model Elements Representing Core Intermediates: MERCI
Goals of the SIG

- Creation of a core model for simulation purposes
  - Especially “full” discrete event-driven simulation
- Enhance portability of simulation models
  - Support specialised simulation platforms
    - Network
    - Reliability
    - Reconfiguration
    - ...
- Ease the integration of Schedulers
  - Modeling of processes and threads
Intermediate Simulation Core Model

- Current work: Behavioural information
  - Reduction of (RD)SEFF to basic control flow instructions
  - Comparable to the RISC approach
  - Explicit semantics of each step
  - Adapted to fit event paradigm
  - Asynchronous communication
  - QoS Annotations

- Structural information
  - Components
  - Active and Passive Resources
  - Network topology (new)

- More detailed extensions can be annotated
  - E.g. network model
The RISC approach

- Reduction to basic instructions
  - Complex instructions are converted to sequence of basic instructions
  - → Less instruction have to be implemented
  - → Gain of expressiveness?!

- Planned Model Elements:
  - Variable Declaration and Assignment: Push, Context
  - Flow Control Statements: Eval, (Goto)
  - Calling Operations: ReceiveRequest, SendRequest
  - System Operations: CreateThread/Process, Fork
Explicit Simulation Semantics

- Especially scopes of variables often unclear
  - Handling of variable scope solely dependent on SimuCom implementation / transformation
  - Include this implicit knowledge in the model
  - Closure like semantics

- How are request handled
  - Currently new process is spawned
  - Usage of interaction pattern
  - Support of threads and processes
Exemplary Model-driven Transformation

Figure: Schematic illustration of our integrated simulation approach
State of Work

- Conceptual behavioral model
  - Ideas documented
  - EMF model required for transformation → Q1 2011

- Implementation:
  - StoEx evaluation ported to C++
  - Prototype integration with OmNeT++ in progress
  - Master thesis bootstrapped for full event based SimuCom
    - Will evaluate parts of the approach

- Static structure planned to be rolled out
Open Questions - Variable Usage

Currently kind of closure semantics is used

Values are diced (almost) every time

Ideas:

- Storage of values through the control flow
- Allow changes to variables → access modifier
- Allow kind of communication through variables
- Process, thread, component, system wide state
Open Questions

- Selection of model elements
  - Is GOTO semantics enough
  - Do we need additional elements

- How are systems “bootstrapped”
  - New process for every request not realistic?!

- Do we need more synchronisation primitives
  - Join threads (limited support today), “synchronized”, . . .

- Is this approach really more scalable?
Conclusion

- PCM Simulation Core still in development
- Reduced set of building blocks
- More expressiveness $\rightarrow$ more problems?
- Many open questions

Thank you for your attention!
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