



**MSc in Informatics Engineering**

**Intermediate Report**

# **Evaluate the robustness of Cloud**

**Gonalo Silva Pereira**

---

Supervisor	Raul Barbosa
Co-Supervisor	Henrique Madeira

---

**Department of Informatics Engineering**  
UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA

March 2, 2015

## *Dedication*

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank to — and to professors Raul Barbosa and Henrique Madeira, who are role models, by their support and help to take good decisions.

Thank my girlfriend for their support, understanding and the fellowship along this path. At my friends and colleagues of Department of Informatics Engineering the patience, support and for all times they have given me.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family for encouragement, love and all the unconditional and constant support that led me to fulfill this dream. Obrigado!

*Gonçalo Silva Pereira*

“ Bridges are normally built on-time, on-budget, and do not fall down. On the other hand, software never comes in on-time or on-budget. In addition, it always breaks down.

*Alfred Z. Spector, Google Research*

”

# Contents

<b>Dedication</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Software Quotes</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Contextualization . . . . .	2
1.2 The project . . . . .	2
1.3 Objectives . . . . .	2
1.4 Document Structure . . . . .	2
1.5 Management . . . . .	4
1.5.1 Meetings . . . . .	4
1.5.2 Risks . . . . .	4
1.5.3 Planning and Tracking . . . . .	4
<b>2 State of the Art</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 SAFE - Robert Natella . . . . .	6
<b>3 Research objectives and approach method</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 GCC Parser vs CDT Parser vs Bison . . . . .	7
3.2 Cloud Computing . . . . .	7
3.3 Applications to inject faults . . . . .	7
<b>4 Current work and preliminary results</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5 Work plan and implications</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 Generate derivations . . . . .	9
5.1.1 Fault Types - Missing: . . . . .	9
5.1.2 Fault Types - Wrong: . . . . .	10
5.1.3 Fault Types - Extraneous: . . . . .	10

5.2	Analyze the effects . . . . .	10
5.3	Compile programs . . . . .	10
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1	Global Vision . . . . .	11
6.2	Future Work . . . . .	11
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendix A - Gantt diagrams</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Appendix B - Risks table</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Appendix C - Decision Tree</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>16</b>

## List of Figures

1	<i>First semester gantt.</i>	12
2	<i>Second semester gantt.</i>	13
3	<i>Risks.</i>	14
4	<i>Decision Tree.</i>	15

## List of Tables

1	Classification of requirements . . . . .	5
---	--	---



## **Abbreviations**

**DDOS** Distributed Denial of Service

**IaaS** Infrastructure-as-a-Service

**PaaS** Platform-as-a-Service

**SaaS** Software-as-a-Service

## Abstract

Inject faults in code of applications, compile them and evaluate the results.

The theme of the dissertation is “Evaluate the robustness of Cloud”.

This thesis/dissertation presents an ????

**Keywords:** Faults, Errors, Failures, Vulnerabilities, Fault Injection, Fault Tolerance, Security, Robustness.

# **1 Introduction**

## **1.1 Contextualization**

The present dissertation describes the work developed in scope of MSc in Informatics Engineering. It is focused in “Evaluate the robustness of Cloud” and this is one subject very important nowadays, because of the increase usage of these services. These services are characterized by the placement of data and software on remote infrastructure. Despite of the numerous benefits, the reliability of these platforms has not kept the needs, and users trust their applications to systems outside of personal control.

In this context, naturally arises the problem of confidence in the entity that manages the platform where applications have been executed. Any organization that put an application in the cloud (for example, Microsoft Azure or Amazon EC2) will have to accept the assurances given by the service provider.

This internship deals with the challenge of assessing the robustness of cloud platforms. The computing service provider uses virtualization to manage and allocate computing power to meet actual needs of the application. Although, there are solid virtualization platforms, fault tolerance is still a research problem.

## **1.2 The project**

This project is based essentially in inject software faults. It was decided to inject software faults, since there are already other people involved in the part of hardware faults.

## **1.3 Objectives**

The main objective of this work is to build a tool to inject software faults in code of some programs before the compilation.

But this main objective is divided in some other goals:

- Generate derivations of main code of selected programs;
- Verify and analyze the effect of produced faults;
- Compile the programs with injected faults, by using make file.

## **1.4 Document Structure**

This document is ...

In the second section ...

In the third section ...  
Finally, in last section ...  
dasdasdsadsdsda

## **1.5 Management**

In this section is described the planning of work developed in stage.

### **1.5.1 Meetings**

In relation a meetings, the supervisor Raul Barbosa and me agreed that meet weekly was the best option. And the meetings were going on, with one or another change of schedule to reconcile with the other activities of both. In addition, I went to several general meeting of the project. Where could discuss concepts and the direction of the project with colleagues and teachers, among them: Raul Barbosa (supervisor), Henrique Madeira (co-supervisor), João Durães and João André Ferro.

### **1.5.2 Risks**

The main-risks of execution of this project are:

- Equipment Failure
- Data lost
- Publication of similar research
- Personal issues interfere with progress
- Student loses interest
- Dispute between student and supervisor
- Supervisor takes excessive time to check final drafts
- Student wants to submit thesis without supervisor approval

The preventative measures and recovery measures can be seen at Appendix C.

### **1.5.3 Planning and Tracking**

In Appendix A, is presented the gantt with the planning tasks to first and to second semester.

I have prioritized the tasks using the nomenclature in Table 1:

Classification	Mean
<i>Must</i>	Must be implement at project finish, and his implementation is priority.
<i>Nice</i>	May be part of the functionality implemented at the end of project, and his implementation is optional.
<i>Wishful</i>	It's specified but his implementation is not expected until the end of project.

Table 1: Classification of requirements

About the development of this project, I have used an *Agile Life Cycle* based in a *Incremental Model*.

What is the requirements of this project???

## 2 State of the Art

Nowadays, people use lot's of services based in cloud and lot's of companies choose to use them too. Using it, companies reduce the costs of IT infrastructure and people don't buy "physical storage" and don't care where are the data. The cloud service provide that the data is secure. But, like any system, the cloud have problems such as another computer systems, software and hardware faults. And the resilience of the cloud is an important characteristic.

The increased use of cloud is related with a low usage of many dedicated servers, lower voltage levels, reduce noise margins and increase clock rates [1].

The cloud providers offers resources ready to deliver [1].

With this work, I want to inject software faults and analyze how the system react to them.

A lot of studies show that the software faults it's the main cause of computer failures.

In this work deliberate how

I had access to the application of Robert Natella, called SAFE, that inject software faults, as I also have to do.

[2] [3]

About 44% of the software faults cannot be emulated [4].

### 2.1 SAFE - Robert Natella

### **3 Research objectives and approach method**

#### **3.1 GCC Parser vs CDT Parser vs Bison**

#### **3.2 Cloud Computing**

Three levels of Cloud Computing:

- Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS);
- Platform-as-a-Service (PaaS);
- Software-as-a-Service (SaaS).

The cloud computing isn't free of external disturbances[1], the most important are:

- Security attacks;
- Accidents;
- Power surges;
- Workload faults;
- Malfunction;
- Worms
- Distributed Denial of Service (DDOS) attacks.

#### **3.3 Applications to inject faults**



## **4 Current work and preliminary results**

## 5 Work plan and implications

Built three separated modules:

- Generate the derivations of main code of selected programs;
- Verify and analyze the effect of produced faults;
- Compile the programs with injected faults, by using make file.

### 5.1 Generate derivations

I chose to use the most representative faults [2], divided into missing, wrong and extraneous, specified individually further down:

#### 5.1.1 Fault Types - Missing:

- **MIFS** - if construct plus statements
- **MLAC** - AND sub-expr in expression used as branch condition
- **MFC** - function call
- **MIA** - if construct around statements
- **MLOC** - OR sub-expr in expression used as branch condition
- **MLPA** - small and localized part of the algorithm
- **MVAE** - variable assignment using an expression
- **MFCT** - functionality
- **MVAV** - variable assignment using an value
- **MIEB** - if construct plus statements plus else before statements
- **MVIV** - variable initialization

### **5.1.2 Fault Types - Wrong:**

- **WLEC** - logical expression used as branch condition
- **WALL** - algorithm - large modifications
- **WVAV** - value assigned to variable
- **WAEP** - arithmetic expression in parameter of function call
- **WSUT** - data types or conversion used
- **WPFV** - variable used in parameter of function call

### **5.1.3 Fault Types - Extraneous:**

- **EVAV** - variable assignment using another variable

## **5.2 Analyze the effects**

The fault injected results is equal to the real software faults?

## **5.3 Compile programs**

Select five to ten programs to test.

## **6 Conclusion**

### **6.1 Global Vision**

Global Vision

### **6.2 Future Work**

Future Work

## 12




Figure 1: *First semester gantt.*

## 2º Semestre




Figure 2: *Second semester gantt.*

## B Appendix B - Risks table

Risc Area	Preventative Measures	Recovery Measures
Equipment Failure	Ensure regular maintenance is undertaken	Use alternative sources/type of equipment as appropriate
	Allow for sufficient funding for repairs	
	Identify alternative sources/type of equipment	
Data lost	Back-up data regularly	
Publication of similar research	Regularly search electronic publications databases	Modify project
	Continue literature review throughout candidature	
	Ensure timely submission	
Personal issues interfere with progress	Take leave of absence (unless for sickness or bereavement)	Re-apply for admission when able to commit
	Take annual leave	
	Take sick leave	
	Communicate with supervisor	
Student loses interest	Select motivating topic at the start	
	Enrolling area ensures a dynamic research culture	
	Improve communication between student and supervisor	
	Look for warning signs	
	Register for support programs/seminars	
	Talk to fellow students in research area	
Dispute between student and supervisor	Understand each other's roles and expectations	
	Agree on dispute resolution process when initiating relationship	
Supervisor takes excessive time to check final drafts	Supervisor to plan out workload	
	Student plan ahead to ensure supervisor will be available	
	Student/Supervisor to review chapters/sections at regular intervals	
Student wants to submit thesis without supervisor approval	Student to be counselled regarding implications - a recommendation of fail or major revision from examiners likely if thesis below standard	Review of thesis by alternative person within University recommended

Figure 3: Risks.

## C Appendix C - Decision Tree




Figure 4: *Decision Tree.*



## References

- [1] K. Wolter, A. Avritzer, M. Vieira, and A. van Moorsel, *Resilience assessment and evaluation of computing systems*. Springer, 2012.
- [2] J. A. Duraes and H. S. Madeira, “Emulation of software faults: A field data study and a practical approach,” *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 849–867, 2006.
- [3] A. Avizzenis, J.-C. Laprie, B. Randell, and C. Landwehr, “Basic concepts and taxonomy of dependable and secure computing.”
- [4] H. Madeira, D. Costa, and M. Vieira, “On the emulation of software faults by software fault injection,” in *Dependable Systems and Networks, 2000. DSN 2000. Proceedings International Conference on*. IEEE, 2000, pp. 417–426.