

THE WHITE ROSE GRID e-Science Centre of Excellence







Provenance-Aware Fault Tolerance for Grid Computing



Professor Jie Xu (*jxu@comp.leeds.ac.uk*) Director of the WRG e-Science Centre of Excellence University of Leeds & University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

The White Rose Grid Project

- The three Yorkshire Universities' project (started in 2001, over £10M investment and research projects) <u>http://www.wrgrid.org.uk/</u>
- Involves Leeds (Profs K Brodlie, P M Dew & J Xu), York (Prof J Austin), and Sheffield (Profs G Tomlinson & P Fleming); under the guidance of the Chief Executive of WRUC (Dr Julian White – CEO of WRUC)
- White Rose University Consortium a strategic partnership of the three Universities -<u>http://www.whiterose.ac.uk</u>
- Excellent partnership with Computing Services & Comp Science (Dr S Chidlow, C Cartledge, Dr A Turner)
- Partners: Esteem Systems in conjunction with Sun Microsystems & Streamline Computing
- Supported by Yorkshire Forward, Y&H Reg Dev Agency





Esteem

🚸 Sun

Center of Excellence

*

SIC



The WRG Architecture



UK e-Science Centres



Our Centre:

- •To offer focus for a variety of e-science issues and activities in our region
- To develop close links with the UK e-Science CP
- To develop a particular specialism: visualisation, distributed diagnostics and system dependability
- The White Rose Grid e-Science Centre of Excellence

UK e-Science Centres (courtesy of NeSC)



National Grid Service





The 'Shared Service' Problem (1)

- A potential approach for achieving fault tolerance in a Grid/Web services environment is to invoke multiple functionally-equivalent services and to act upon the results returned from them, e.g. by comparison or voting.
- A problem for this fault tolerance approach, however, *is* that in most SOA models, the implementational details of a service are hidden from a client of the service.
- The only information available to a client is the service's interface and possibly some QoS metadata.
- This is an issue as services that initially appear disparate may during the course of their execution – invoke one or more identical, "shared" services.

The 'Shared Service' Problem (2)

• The result is that different services may use the same shared services behind the scenes, which may make common mode failure (CMF) much more likely.



A Solution to This Problem

- One possible way of resolving this problem is to incorporate the technique of **provenance** in the fault tolerance approach used.
- Provenance is the documentation of the process that leads to a result.
- If we assume that data provenance is recorded, it will allow a fault tolerance scheme to build up a "view" of how each result it receives has been constructed.
- By possessing this view, a number of actions can be taken upon the results returned, e.g. weightings can be assigned to each service based upon how closely related it is to another service; services that have many common-dependencies can therefore have less "sway" in the voting algorithm used.

Weighted Voting

- In this "view", s1 and s2 have 2 common dependencies, whilst s3 has no common dependencies.
- As a trivial example, we could therefore assign weightings of 0.5 to s1 and s2, and 1.0 to s3.
- In this case, should s1 and s2 agree, but s3 disagree with a result, then no overall "trusted" result will emerge.



FT-Grid: A framework for achieving fault tolerance

- We have implemented a javabased framework that facilitates the creation of fault tolerance schemes based on diverse services. This is called *FT-Grid*.
- The current implementation consists of both an API allowing developers to easily search for, invoke, and vote on services at run-time, and also a GUI to demonstrate the system.



Comparison of Three Schemes

- Using FT-Grid, we developed a system that built up weightings based on the historical results of each service (the frequency with which a service's results agreed with the consensus). 15 Web services were involved and a Grid provenance system, called PASOA (developed at Southampton), was employed.
- We developed three systems in total:
 - A system without fault tolerance
 - A 'traditional' MVS system
 - A provenance-aware MVS system
- The traditional MVS system discarded results from services that had a weighting below a user-specified value, whilst the provenanceaware scheme discarded results where any service in a workflow fell below a user-specified value.
- This experiment yielded a large set of empirical data, and stresstested both FT-Grid and the underlying infrastructure.

Some Experimental Results

	Correct result	No result	CMF
Experiment 1 Run 1	828	172	-
Experiment 1 Run 2	858	142	-
Experiment 1 Run 3	822	178	-
Average	836	164	-
Experiment 2 Run 1	928	9	63
Experiment 2 Run 2	921	14	65
Experiment 2 Run 3	921	7	72
Average	923.33	10	66.66
Experiment 3 Run 1	996	4	0
Experiment 3 Run 2	990	10	0
Experiment 3 Run 3	996	4	0
Average	994	6	0

• We performed 3 runs of 1000 tests on each scheme:







Brief Result Analysis

- The scheme without fault tolerance obtained a correct result in **83.6%** of all tests performed.
- The traditional MVS scheme obtained a correct result in **92.3%** of all tests performed, and a common-mode failure (CMF) occurred in **6.6%** of results.
- The provenance-aware MVS scheme obtained a correct result in **99.4%** of tests performed, and had no CMF.
- These results are encouraging, but it must be remembered that the test scenario was very simple, and in a more realistic environment (with more reliable services), the advantage of the provenance-aware scheme is likely to be reduced.
- We are making progress...



THE WHITE ROSE GRID e-Science Centre of Excellence

Questions?

