



Toward Broad-Spectrum Autonomic Management

Edmund Smith <edmund.smith@stir.ac.uk>


Paul Anderson <dcspaul@inf.ed.ac.uk>

ICN 2007, April 2007

Overview

- Background
 - *“system configuration” & “autonomics”*
 - *a comparison & a practical illustration*
- The problem
 - *most practical “fabrics” require elements of both*
 - *this means that there is usually no clear declarative specification for the fabric configuration*
- A proposed approach
 - *a integrated multi-resolution framework*
 - *further research*

System Configuration



System Configuration

- Starting with:
 - *several hundred new machines with empty disks*
 - *a repository of all the necessary software packages*
 - *a specification of the required service*
- Load the software and configure the machines to provide the service
- This involves many internal services:
 - *DNS, LDAP, DHCP, NFS, NIS, SMTP, Web ...*
 - *the relationships are most important*
- Maintain the specification when things change
 - *either the requirements, or the system (failures)*

Autonomics

- Autonomic computer systems are ones which:
“Maintain and adjust their operation in the face of changing workloads, demands, and external conditions, and in the face of hardware or software failures of innocent, or malicious origin.”

J Kephart

Autonomics

- Autonomic operations can occur at any level in the configuration “stack” -
 - *recreate a corrupt configuration file on one host*
 - *restart a failed daemon on one host*
 - *redeploy a service to another host when a host fails*
 - *configure extra hosts into a cluster when the overall load increases*
- Autonomics can be thought of as the automation of the entire system configuration process

A comparison

- The fields of *Autonomics* and *System Configuration* have evolved in separate communities with a different emphasis -
 - *System configuration* provides ways of specifying and managing the configuration of an infrastructure, and “low-level” autonomics
 - *Autonomics* provide solutions to “high-level” automation, such as service migration
- Current practical installations use elements of both


An example

- A high-level autonomic process may determine which nodes are to be used to provide the elements of a web-service - web front-end, database etc.
 - *this will handle service migration and reconfiguration in response to load or failures*
- Lower-level system configuration tools support (re-)configuration of the underlying infrastructure
 - *DNS, Kerberos, firewall holes, backups, etc.*

The problem

- Modern system configuration tools allow the fabric configuration to be maintained from an explicit declarative specification.
- This is important -
 - *we can reason about the configuration - eg. for security verification*
 - *we can compose multiple aspects*
- If the configuration is manipulated by a separate autonomic layer, then the overall declarative specification is usually lost


An example - LCFG



What do we need?

- A model which supports a uniform configuration process at all levels
- Manual and autonomic elements of the specification must be integrated so that it is possible to reason across the whole system
 - *for example, about authorisation*
- Autonomic components must generate configurations which are governed by declarative constraints
 - *“loose” specifications*

A multi-resolution framework



Further research

- Specification languages -
 - constraints (mcfg)
 - aspect composition (mcfg)
 - authorisation (cfgas)
 - multi-resolution specifications
- Deployment
 - distributed evaluation
 - deployment sequencing

Some Links



- Slides:
<http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/dcspaul/publications/icn2007-slides.pdf>
- Paper:
<http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/dcspaul/publications/icn2007.pdf>
- Paul Anderson
<http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/dcspaul>
<dcspaul@inf.ed.ac.uk>
- LISA, Large installation System Administration Conference
November 11th-16th 2007, Dallas
<http://www.usenix.org/events/lisa07/>