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Abstract

In principle, it would have been desirable for any system to have self-* capabilities when faced with changes that might occur either in the system or its environment. However, these capabilities are difficult to incorporate in certain classes of systems, mainly those in which uncertainties in their behaviours are not desirable. In this position paper, we discuss how the expected degree of autonomy of a system is related to the way in which a system can be described. The discussion is presented in the context of predictability and the assurances associated with the accuracy of that predictability. The subject of this paper are those systems known to be critical in the services they deliver, and which cannot incorporate high degree of uncertainty.

1. Introduction

As computer based systems become more complex, design solutions that promote their operational autonomy have become the holy grail of system architects and designers. Moreover, system autonomy should not be restricted to the actual services delivered by the system, but it should also be associated with the infrastructure that enables the system to deliver its services with a certain degree of quality. In other words, although autonomy is not something that is observed at the system interface, it should nevertheless enable the system to provide its services as specified.

Self-* capabilities are the means by which a system attains its autonomy, and these capabilities have an impact upon the system’s fundamental properties, which are functionality, usability, performance, cost, and dependability. In this paper, properties and capabilities are considered to be two different concepts, the former is a system attribute that can be directly measured and quantified, while the latter are the means that enable one or more of the system properties. Although some aspects of self-* capabilities might allow the system to provide different kinds of services, the view taken in this paper is that system capabilities are essentially enablers for improving the system non-functional properties. In addition to self-* capabilities, the system might have other capabilities whose purpose is also to enhance the quality of services provided by the system, and reduce the cost for providing them.

This paper explores the relationship between self-* capabilities and predictability, which is a fundamental aspect in the design, operation and evaluation of a certain class of systems. The objective of this exercise is to identify, from the perspective of predictability, what type of systems should the self-* capabilities be associated with, and what techniques could be used to attain such capabilities. This would allow establishing the theoretical and practical limits that can be associated with the different approaches that are employed in the development of systems.

Systems in general can be described either in terms of process or data [8][11]. While the former characterises the system as acted upon, the latter characterises the system as sensed [11]. A major difference between these two forms of description is the amount of information required for modelling a system. The process description of a system usually involves less information than its counterpart. Moreover, it might be the case that due to its very nature, the data description of systems becomes unbounded, which is not the case in the process description of systems.

These two forms of system representation will be used as a basis for investigating the provision of self-* capabilities in different classes of systems. Depending on the system, expectations on the degree of autonomy of a system might be curtailed depending on the assumptions made and the properties of that system. In the next section, we present how self-* capabilities can be incorporated into systems that are essentially represented as process and data, and finally, we present some concluding remarks.
2. Process and Data Representation of Systems

The complexity of systems and the way they are integrated will require new approaches for their development, operation, and maintenance. Conventional deterministic approaches may not be sufficient for enabling the provision of a wide range of services that are expected from these systems. Several new approaches have recently emerged from different areas, such as, biologically inspired computing, software engineering and agent technology, just to mention a few. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to the first two areas. Issues related to agent technology and dependability were recently discussed on two panels [4][7].

The provision of self-* capabilities by software engineering solutions essentially relies on the representation of systems as processes, in which solutions are normally based on the feedback control loop principle. Meta-parameters of system behaviour and structure, and its environment, are monitored for eventual changes so that the system can be adjusted for delivering required services in a stable way. The degree of self-* capabilities that can be achieved by employing these solutions is limited because of the need for having predictive behaviours, otherwise reaction to changes would not be deterministic. Predictability is achieved by removing operational uncertainties from the system otherwise these could disrupt the normal operation of the system. In other words, it is fundamental that during the development of these systems the complete state specification is identified, or else the occurrence of unexpected states can lead to system failures. Considering such restrictions, can a process oriented system be able to show self-* capabilities? They might be able, but the degree of autonomy is restricted, and it might be the case that these capabilities need to be established during design time.

On the other hand, the provision of self-* capabilities by biologically inspired solutions essentially relies on the representation of systems as data. Since these solutions are based on a sample of the whole data associated with a system, complete system models are difficult to obtain, which explains why uncertainties are an inherent aspect of these models. Incorporating learning capabilities into a system might eliminate this deficiency, however these are likely to introduce another degree of uncertainty. Emergent behaviours might be useful in dealing with unexpected circumstances, but the system reaction to these might become unpredictable.

It has been claimed that data oriented approaches might be appropriate for new emerging applications, but in what capacity is not yet clear. One issue however is clear, if predictability has to be an essential capability in the development and operation of a system, then a data oriented approach might not be an appropriate solution. This is particularly significant in those classes of systems in which performance and dependability constraints are critical. However, data oriented approaches could nevertheless be employed in such systems if sufficient protections are incorporated into their designs. Again such conservative solution would restrict one of the major benefits of data oriented approaches, which is that of emergent behaviours. An alternative approach, yet not fully explored, would be to build massively redundant systems, in which the failure of some the components would not affect the expected outcome of the whole system. However, for such solution to be successful, diverse data oriented approaches should be composed in order to increase their combined effectiveness, or coverage. However, a major weakness in such configuration would be the quality of the training data. If the data is not good, it does not matter how many approaches are employed if all of them suffer the same deficiencies.

Still considering the idea of exploring data oriented approaches in the context of systems containing trillions of components, issues like the identification of the source of change is important for establishing the appropriate mechanisms to deal with the change. For example, changes that occur internally to a component and that eventually affect the behaviour of that component, how these should be handle in the wider system? If the rest of the system was able to accommodate the unknown behaviours, what should be the threshold to which the system should react either for eliminating a whole group of abnormal components, or incorporating these components as normal? The reverse also raises very interesting questions. If the environment of a system changes, how these changes are reflected upon the components of that system: either the components are eliminated from the system, or the components have to be modified for coping with the changes. All these decisions affect the predictability of the overall system behaviour if clear strategies are not implemented. However, as already mentioned, it might be the case that the combined usage of diverse strategies might be the only way of bringing out the best of the system, which eventually might lead to unpredictabilities.

In the following, we present two approaches that serve as an example of process and data oriented systems, respectively.

2.1. Architectural Approaches

Architectural representations of systems have shown to be effective in assisting the understanding of broader system concerns by abstracting away from details of the system. To leverage the dependability properties of systems, solutions are
needed at the architectural level that are able to
guide the structuring of dependable components
into a fault tolerant architecture. Fault tolerance,
one of the means to dependability, is related to the
self-repair and self-healing capabilities [1].

Architectural flexibility for supporting run time
change can be achieved by using specialised co-
operative connectors to change the pattern of
collaboration between components: components are
rigid entities, and how they interact provide the
basis for adaptability [3][5]. Each collaboration is
identified in terms of pre- and post-conditions, and
invariants. Depending on the required change, a
different collaboration is selected that makes the
system to change its behaviour. All the
collaborations are defined during design time
together with their respective trigger conditions.
Uncertainty between the alternative collaborations
does not exist because choice has to be
deterministic, and uncertainties associated with a
particular collaboration is restricted because
behavioural invariants have to be maintained.

In a different work, in order to deal with
undesirable, though expected circumstances, an
idealised architectural component was defined with
structure and behaviour equivalent to that of the
idealised fault-tolerant component concept [8]. This
approach was later extended to deal with
commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software
components [9]. The basic mechanism to deal with
the expected circumstances employed in these
approaches was exception handling. The system
architect must know from the outset what
exceptions might occur, the causes associated with
these exceptions, and there is the need to match
these exceptions with their respective handlers. The
predictability in these systems is obtained by
clearly identifying what is expected, and avoiding
the system to become brittle towards the
unexpected. How a system reacts towards expected
circumstances should be know beforehand and
should be incorporated in the design of the system.

Alternative techniques could be employed if
undesirable circumstances, i.e. faults, could be
grouped in terms of classes. Instead of the need for
identifying specific handlers for each type of
undesirable circumstance, as mentioned above,
general solutions based on replication, diversity,
and consensus could be devised. However, although
these systems would be robust towards certain
classes of faults, they are not considered
sufficiently robust towards any class. In all these
approaches, there is almost no degree of autonomy
for the sake of obtaining predictable behaviour,
which was an essential requirement of the
applications involved.

2.2. Artificial Immune Systems

Artificial immune systems are adaptive systems
inspired by theoretical immunology and observed
immune functions, principles and models, which
are applied to complex problems [2]. A number of
works have attempted to build artificial immune
systems for fault tolerance, virus detection, and
computer security. In particular, the creation of
immunised fault tolerant embedded systems has
been proposed [13], which explores negative
selection, an immune inspired algorithm, for the
generation of error detectors [1]. More recently,
this work has been extended to incorporate the
capability of generating adaptable error detectors
during run time, thus providing the means for the
system to adapt itself to previously unexpected and
undesirable circumstances. The incorporation of
this capability has come to a price: the accuracy in
detecting erroneous states has decreased when
compared with that of an equivalent well craft
engineered system; other studies have drawn the
same conclusions [11].

The application of data oriented approaches to
task detection, that could be either the consequence
of faults or intrusions, clearly illustrates the
limitations associated with these approaches. Since
faults and intrusions are considered rare events, the
question to be asked is how the system is able to
learn from rare events. If some correlation could be
established between rare events, then the process of
identifying new undesirable events could be based
on the extrapolation of what is already known.
However, this assumption cannot be generalised,
since it is difficult to establish the correlation
between undesirable events. An alternative
approach could be that of learning new undesirable
events from what is already known about the
erroneous states of the system. This is a
daunting challenge if we consider that the state
space of normal behaviours might be much larger if
compared with that of abnormal behaviour. Either
the normal behavioural state can be encoded in such
way that facilitates the search process, or such an
approach becomes prohibitive in terms of efficiency
and storage.

Another problem that is inherent in data
oriented approaches is the data itself. In addition for
the need to the data to be representative of the
actual system, there is also the need to have a deep
understanding what the data represents. If either of
these issues are not observed the predictability of
the system is affected.

3. Conclusions

Although in this paper, the issues concerning self-*
capabilities of systems were presented in terms of
the dichotomy on how systems are represented, i.e.
process versus data, we have not overlook the possibility of systems relying on both representations for achieving different degrees of autonomy depending on the services to be delivered. The idea of developing systems that rely on both process and data representations, which explores the complementary benefits of these, is not new. Such hybrid systems have mostly been confined to stand alone closed systems, however the challenge ahead is whether the same idea can be applied to more complex systems that are open and collaborative in their nature, and which are expected to show self-* capabilities and be predictive at the same time.
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