#### **Principles of Provenance**

eScience Institute Theme Opening Lecture

James Cheney April 15, 2008

- Records of origin, modification, influences
- Where something "comes from"





- Evidence of authenticity, integrity, quality
- Certifies products of good "process"





- Valuable because hard to collect, verify
- Necessary to assign credit



- Valuable because hard to collect, verify
- Necessary to assign credit and blame





## Why is it important for data?

- For traditional (paper) information:
  - Creation process leaves "paper trail"
  - Easier to detect modification, copying, forgery
  - Can usually judge a book by its cover
- For *electronic* information:
  - Often no such thing as a "bit trail"
  - Easy to forge, plagiarize, alter data undetected
  - Can't judge a database by its cover there isn't one
- Provenance essential for judging quality of data

## This talk

- Areas where provenance is needed
  - bioinformatics & other curated scientific databases
  - workflow/grid/distributed computation
- Why this is a hard problem
  - & why principles/foundations need development
- Areas of CS that can help
- Overview of Principles of Provenance theme

#### **Relevance to eScience?**

- Curated scientific (biological) databases
  - Manual curation process
  - Need provenance for quality control, accountability
  - Currently maintained by hand
- Scientific workflows. grid computation
  - Hides a complex execution process
  - Need provenance for reproducibility, efficiency
  - Currently provided by various customized systems

## **Biological databases**

- 1000s of specialized biological DBs
  - Independent
  - Heterogeneous
  - Change frequently
- Many curated
  - Expensive!



 Created by manual effort of scientists



- Created by manual effort of scientists
- Curators copy from papers, other DBs



- Created by manual effort of scientists
- Curators copy from papers, other DBs
  - Which often copy from each other...



- Created by manual effort of scientists
- Curators copy from papers, other DBs
  - Which often copy from each other...
- Some sources unreliable



- Created by manual effort of scientists
- Curators copy from papers, other DBs
  - Which often copy from each other...
- Some sources unreliable
  - and some curators too



## **State of practice**

- Scientists believe provenance essential for curated DBs
- Existing systems do not track provenance well
- Instead, curators currently do this manually
  - boring; waste of curators' valuable time (= \$\$)
- or using ad hoc, custom systems
  - few guarantees; lots of wheel reinvention
- Want to automatically record provenance

### Where-provenance

#### Where-provenance

- Shows where data in each tuple was "copied from"
- [Buneman, Khanna, Tan 2001]



## Why-provenance

#### Why-provenance:

- Shows sets of tuples "contributing" to result tuple
- [Buneman, Khanna, Tan 2001]
- See also: "lineage"
  - [Cui, Widom, Wiener 2000]



#### How-provenance

#### How-provenance:

- Gives "expression" showing "how" tuple was obtained from input
- [Green, Karvounarakis, Tannen 2007]



### What curators do now



#### What curators do now



### **Copy-paste provenance**



- First approach to provenance for manually curated databases
  - Sequence of inserts, deletes, copies
  - [Buneman, Chapman, Cheney 2006]

 Computations packaged into workflows





- Computations packaged into workflows
- Workflow engine executes program



- Computations packaged into workflows
- Workflow engine executes program



- Computations packaged into workflows
- Workflow engine executes program



- Computations packaged into workflows
- Workflow engine executes program



- Computations packaged into workflows
- Workflow engine executes program
- A workflow can be executed in different ways



- Provenance should show what actually happened
  - so that we can repeat computation
  - or track down bugs

RD := Blast\_1(QD)



- Provenance should show what actually happened
  - so that we can repeat computation
  - or track down bugs
- RD := Blast\_1(QD)
  RC := UniProt(QC,RD)
  RB := MouseDB(QB)



- Provenance should show what actually happened
  - so that we can repeat computation
  - or track down bugs

```
RD := Blast_1(QD)
RC := UniProt(QC,RD)
RB := MouseDB(QB)
RA := Blast_2(QA,RB,RC)
```



- Provenance should show what actually happened
  - so that we can repeat computation
  - or track down bugs

```
RD := Blast_1(QD)
RC := UniProt(QC,RD)
RB := MouseDB(QB)
RA := Blast_2(QA,RB,RC)
RW := Format Results(RA)
```



- Provenance should show what actually happened
  - so that we can repeat computation
  - or compare two runs
- RD' := Blast\_2(QD)
  RC' := UniProt(QC,RD')
  RB' := MouseDB(QB)
  RA' := Blast\_1(QA,RB',RC')
  RW' := Format Results(RA')



## **State of practice**

- Useful for efficient recomputation
  - May also reassure users
- Coarse-grained model
  - Computation steps are "black boxes"
  - Doesn't deal well with structured data (DBs, XML)
  - Can't track errors at data level
- Does not deal with updates to data
  - What if DB gets updated in the middle of a workflow?

## The real problem

- Many systems, few specifications
  - what makes a technique correct?
  - how will we know when we've solved the problem?
  - how to generalize existing techniques?
- Little understanding of
  - "correctness", "completeness"
  - suitability for given application
  - relationships among techniques

# Why is this hard? (1)

- Users can't always explain
  - what they want
  - what they need
  - these are not necessarily identical!
- This is not a criticism of users
  - This is our (computer scientists') job
  - Not enough interaction between CS research and potential users

#### Want vs. need

 "Users usually ask for what they want; our job is to figure out what they really need."

--Jim Gosling, paraphrase

- If scientists want provenance information...
- What needs drive this want?
  - Data integrity/quality filtering?
  - Error correction/propagation?
  - Credit/citation?
  - Efficiency?

## Can needs be met?

- Most provenance information currently is
  - added manually
  - or maintained by customized systems
- Reasonable to automate/generalize?
  - Is "intelligence" needed?
  - maybe this is an AI problem...
- Automatic, general purpose systems must:
  - provide clear guarantees
  - elucidate responsibilities of users

# Why is this hard? (2)

- In practice, several working definitions used
  - DBs: polygen, lineage , why, where, how
  - Workflows: variants of "directed acyclic graphs"
- But little agreement about definitions, goals
  - what is foo-provenance?
  - what is foo-prov for?
- # definitions ≈ # systems/papers
  - Not a good thing! Tower of Babel effect

## What should we be storing?

- Store "everything"
  - But this is impossible
  - Unbounded amount of information we could track
- Store whatever the users (say they) want
  - Difficult to please everyone
  - Hard to justify adding to general purpose systems
  - May not address (unstated) needs
- Store "enough"
  - What is "enough"?

## How much is "enough"?

- This depends on what we want to do with the information
  - But we don't always know this in advance!
- Thus, provenance should be as general as possible
  - "Suitable" for many applications
  - While still being "manageable"
- Not sure what this means yet
- This is why foundational study is needed!

# Why is this hard? (3)

- Claim: Work on provenance treads in deep philosophical waters
  - Seldom recognized!
- Causality, influence, dependence
- Explanation, justification
- Knowledge, belief
- are all nontrivial concepts
  - many with relatively little formal understanding

## **Some Pseudo-Definitions**

- Papers on provenance are littered with pseudo-definitions such as
  - "the process which led to a result"
  - "a summary of the history and context of the data"
  - "the parts of the input that influenced (or that explains) a part of the output"
  - "the part of the input that shows where a part of the output came from"
  - "a causal graph that shows how a result was computed"



## Hume on causality

- What does it mean to say "A causes B"?
  - e.g. Rain causes the sidewalk to get wet
  - e.g. Flame causes heat
- WWHD? (What would Hume do?)
- Hume said:
  - Thus we remember to have seen that species of object we call FLAME, and to have felt that species of sensation we call HEAT. We likewise call to mind their constant conjunction in all past instances. Without any further ceremony, we call the one CAUSE and the other EFFECT, and infer the existence of the one from that of the other.



## Hume on causality

- Usual interpretation of Hume's views:
  - causal relationships are not real things that we can directly perceive
  - Instead, causality is (only) psychological!
  - A causes B means in our experience whenever we observe A, we also observe B
- Since then most scientific disciplines have eschewed causality in favor of correlation
- Is (causality-oriented) provenance legitimate?

#### Modern view

- Causality = correlation view is changing.
- Causality is neither settled nor trivial.
- Much recent activity in philosophy, AI:







## **Relevance to Computer Science?**

#### Databases

- Data models, query languages, expressiveness
- Concurrency/distributed computing
  - Workflow models, causality, explanation
- Programming Languages/Software Engineering
  - Bidirectional, adaptive programming, dependency analysis, program slicing
- Systems/Security
  - Integrity, (information flow) security, trust

#### **Provenance in databases**

- Provenance in database queries/views
  - Polygen, source tagging [WM 1990]
  - Lineage [CWW 2000], Trio [Widom et al. 2005/6],
  - "why" and "where" [BKT 2001]
  - Semiring-valued relations and "how" [GKT07]
- Provenance for database updates
  - Simple "copy-paste" curation model [BCC06]
  - Extended to SQL-like updates [BCV07]

## **Provenance in workflows**

- Focus on system development
  - based on a variety of ad hoc provenance models
- Many similar efforts in
  - Geospatial inf. syst. [Bose, Frew 2005, ...]
  - Kepler system [Ludaescher et al.]
  - PASOA project [Groth, Moreau, Miles]
  - **Taverna**, myGrid [Goble et al.]
  - Provenance Challenge(s), Open Provenance Model [Moreau, Freire, et al.]

## **Provenance in PL**

- Provenance-like concepts widespread in PL
  - Ine-number maintenance for error messages
  - debugging symbol propagation
  - dependency analysis and program slicing
    - [CAA07] used to define a new form of DB provenance
  - adaptive functional programming [ABH02,...]
    - similar to view maintenance in DBs
  - bidirectional computation [Foster et al. 05,...]
    - similar to view update in DBs

## **Provenance in systems/security**

#### Provenance aware storage systems (PASS)

 Records "provenance" at level of file system/OS calls [Muniswamy-Reddy et al. 2006]

#### Information flow security [e.g. Myers/Liskov 97]

- Ensure that low-security outputs cannot depend on high-security inputs
- Connections to why-prov, dependency analysis
- Trust and Security in Virtual Communities
  - concurrent eSI Theme, Jan-Dec 2008

#### Problems

- Provenance-like ideas occur in (or may benefit from) many areas of CS
- But there is little contact between these areas
  - and little recognition of provenance as a deep and interesting cross-disciplinary problem
- And often little contact between CS and working scientists
  - hence, research efforts may miss the mark

## What we already did

- Last November, held a 1.5-day Workshop on Principles of Provenance (in Edinburgh)
  - 12 invited/contributed abstracts & talks
  - 25-30 participants
- My observations:
  - Many interesting discussions; not enough follow-up.
  - Would have been great to keep the participants together longer...
  - and focus on certain key areas

## **Principles of Provenance Theme**

- Running April 2008 March 2009
- Goals:
  - Support focused research into foundations of provenance in computer science
  - Bridge CS/eScience gap
  - Identify key problems and set research agenda
  - Disseminate results and incubate further research programs/funding proposals
- Led by James Cheney, Peter Buneman, Bertram Ludaescher (U. C. Davis) April 15, 2008

## What we will do

- We plan to host four small symposia focusing on these areas
  - 3-5 **CS researchers** working on provenance
  - 3-5 working scientists with provenance needs
  - One day of public lectures and discussion
  - Follow-up research/collaboration time
  - Nominal goal of drafting white paper
    - summarize state of art and future directions for each area
  - But hope for more (collaboration/papers/proposals)

## What we will do (2)

 We also plan to organize another Principles of Provenance Workshop

- Present results, white papers
- Solicit contributions from community
- Hope to have (tentative)
  - peer-review
  - formal publication
  - collocation with external conference
- Target: Q1-2 2009

## **Current plan**

- May 19-23, 2008: Provenance in Databases
  - public talks/discussion on May 21
- late July 2008: Provenance in Workflow, Grid, and Distributed Computation
- Q4 2008: Provenance in Programming Languages and Software Engineering
- Q1 2009: Provenance in Operating Systems and Security
- Q2 2009: Follow-up workshop

## **Current plan**

#### Additional speakers as opportunities arise

- Stuart Madnick (MIT)
  - TBA, April/May
- Umut Acar (Toyota Technological Institute, Chicago)
  - "Adaptive functional programming", late May
- Suggestions welcome!

#### Conclusions

#### Provenance

- Important for scientific record(s)
- few clear definitions/problem statements
- Principles of Provenance theme will...
  - develop foundations of subject
  - build awareness of problems
    - & connect provenance in different CS disciplines
  - engage with scientists/DB curators
    - to make sure we're solving the right problems

#### More information

#### http://wiki.esi.ac.uk/Principles\_of\_Provenance



Principles of Provenance