

Winds of Change: From Vendor Lock-in to the Meta Cloud



Konduru Bhuvaneswari

Dept of Software Engineering,
SKR College of Engineering and Technology,
Nh-5, Kondurusatram, Manubolu, Spsr Nellore, Ap.



Syed Baji, Ph.D

Associate Professor,
Dept of Software Engineering,
SKR College of Engineering and Technology,
Nh-5, Kondurusatram, Manubolu, Spsr Nellore, Ap.

ABSTRACT:

The cloud computing paradigm has achieved widespread adoption in recent years. Its success is due largely to customers' ability to use services on demand with a pay-as-you go pricing model, which has proved convenient in many respects. Low costs and high flexibility make migrating to the cloud compelling. Despite its obvious advantages, however, many companies hesitate to "move to the cloud," mainly because of concerns related to service availability, data lock-in, and legal uncertainties.¹ Lock in is particularly problematic. For one thing, even though public cloud availability is generally high, outages still occur.² Businesses locked into such a cloud are essentially at a standstill until the cloud is back online. Moreover, public cloud providers generally don't guarantee particular service level agreements (SLAs)³ — that is, businesses locked into a cloud have no guarantees that it will continue to provide the required quality of service (QoS). Finally, most public cloud providers' terms of service let that provider unilaterally change pricing at any time. Hence, a business locked into a cloud has no mid- or long term control over its own IT costs. At the core of all these problems, we can identify a need for businesses to permanently monitor the cloud they're using and be able to rapidly "change horses" — that is, migrate to a different cloud if they discover problems or if their estimates predict future issues.

EXISTING SYSTEM:

Cloud providers are flooding the market with a confusing body of services, including computer services such as the Amazon Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2) and VMware v Cloud, or key-value stores, such as the Amazon Simple Storage Service (S3). Some of these services are

conceptually comparable to each other, whereas others are vastly different, but they're all, ultimately, technically incompatible and follow no standards but their own. To further complicate the situation, many companies not (only) build on public clouds for their cloud computing needs, but combine public offerings with their own private clouds, leading to so-called hybrid clouds.

DISADVANTAGES OF EXISTING SYSTEM:

vastly Some of these services are conceptually comparable to each other, whereas others are different, but they're all, ultimately, technically incompatible and follow no standards but their own.

PROPOSED SYSTEM:

Here, we introduce the concept of a meta cloud that incorporates design time and runtime components. This meta cloud would abstract away from existing offerings' technical incompatibilities, thus mitigating vendor lock-in. It helps users find the right set of cloud services for a particular use case and supports an application's initial deployment and runtime migration.

ADVANTAGES OF PROPOSED SYSTEM:

This meta cloud would abstract away from existing offerings' technical incompatibilities, thus mitigating vendor lock-in. It helps users find the right set of cloud services for particular use case and supports an application's initial deployment and runtime migration.

Cloud Computing Use Case:

Let's consider a Web-based sports portal for an event such as the Olympic Games, which allows users to place bets. An event this large requires an enormously efficient and reliable infrastructure, and the cloud computing paradigm provides the necessary flexibility and elasticity for such a scenario. It lets service providers handle short-term usage spikes without needing respective dedicated resources available continuously. The problem, however, is that once an application has been developed based on one particular provider's cloud services and using its specific API, that application is bound to that provider; deploying it on another cloud would usually require completely redesigning and rewriting it.

Such vendor lock-in leads to strong dependence on the cloud service operator. In the sports portal example, in addition to the ability to scale applications up and down by dynamically allocating and releasing resources, we must consider additional aspects, such as resource costs and regional communication bandwidth and latency. Let's assume the sports betting portal application is based on a load balancer that forwards HTTP requests to numerous computing nodes hosting a Web application that lets users submit a bet. Request handlers place bet records in a message queue and subsequently store them in a relational database.

Let's further assume a service provider realizes this scenario using only Amazon Web Services (AWS), EC2 to host applications, Simple Queue Service (SQS) as its cloud message queue, and the Relational Database Service (RDS) as a database system. Instead of being bound to one cloud operator, however, the betting application should be hosted in an optimal cloud environment. To leverage a more diverse cloud landscape, support flexibility, and avoid vendor lock-in, the meta cloud must achieve two main goals:

- find the optimal combination of cloud services for a certain application with regard to QoS for users and price for hosting; and
- develop a cloud-based application once, then run it anywhere, including support for runtime migration. Lately, the meta cloud idea has received some attention, and several approaches try to tackle at least parts of the problem.

Current Weather in the (Meta) Cloud:

First, standardized programming APIs must enable developers to create cloud-neutral applications that aren't hardwired to any single provider or cloud service. Cloud provider abstraction libraries such as libcloud (<http://libcloud.apache.org>), fog (<http://fog.io>), and jclouds (www.jclouds.org) provide unified APIs for accessing different vendors' cloud products. Using these libraries, developers are relieved of technological vendor lock-in because they can switch cloud providers for their applications with relatively low overhead. As a second ingredient, the meta cloud uses resource templates to define concrete features that the application requires from the cloud. For instance, an application must be able to specify that it requires a given number of computing resources, Internet access, and database storage. Some current tools and initiatives — for example, Amazon's CloudFormation (<http://aws.amazon.com/cloudformation/>) or the upcoming TOSCA specification (www.oasis-open.org/committees/tosca) — are working toward similar goals and can be adapted to provide these required features for the meta cloud. In addition to resource templates, the automated formation and provisioning of cloud applications also depends on sophisticated features to actually deploy and install applications automatically.

Predictable and controlled application deployment is a central issue for cost-effective and efficient deployments in the cloud, and even more so for the meta cloud. Several application provisioning solutions exist, enabling developers and administrators to declaratively specify deployment artifacts and dependencies to allow for repeatable and managed resource provisioning. Notable examples include Opscode Chef (www.opscode.com/chef), Puppet (<http://puppetlabs.com>), and juju (<http://juju.ubuntu.com>). At runtime, an important aspect of the meta cloud is application monitoring, which enables the meta cloud to decide whether it's necessary to provision new instances of the application or migrate parts of it. Various vendors provide tools for cloud monitoring, ranging from system-level monitoring (such as CPU and bandwidth) to application-level monitoring (Amazon's CloudWatch; <http://aws.amazon.com/cloudwatch/>) to SLA monitoring (as with monitis; <http://portal.monitis.com/index.php/cloud-monitoring>). However, the meta cloud requires more sophisticated monitoring techniques and, in particular, approaches for making automated provisioning decisions at runtime based on current application users' context and location.

Inside the Meta Cloud:

To some extent, we can realize the meta cloud based on a combination of existing tools and concepts, part of which we just examined. Figure 1 depicts the meta cloud's main components. We can categorize these components based on whether they're important mainly for cloud software engineers during development time or whether they perform tasks during runtime. We illustrate their interplay using the sports betting portal example.

Meta Cloud API:

The meta cloud API provides a unified programming interface to abstract from the differences among provider API implementations. For customers, using this API prevents their application from being hard wired to a specific cloud service offering. The meta cloud API can build on available cloud provider abstraction APIs, as previously mentioned. Although these deal mostly with keyvalue stores and compute services, in principle, all services can be covered that are abstract enough for more than one provider to offer and whose specific APIs don't differ too much, conceptually.

Resource Templates:

Developers describe the cloud services necessary to run an application using resource templates. They can specify service types with additional properties, and a graph model expresses the interrelation and functional dependencies between services. Developers create the meta cloud resource templates using a simple domain-specific language (DSL), letting them concisely specify required resources. Resource definitions are based on a hierarchical composition model; thus developers can create configurable and reusable template components, which enable them and their teams to share and reuse common resource templates in different projects. Using the DSL, developers model their application components and their basic runtime requirements, such as (provider independently normalized) CPU, memory, and I/O capacities, as well as dependencies and weighted communication relations between these components. The provisioning strategy uses the weighted component relations to determine the application's optimal deployment configuration. Moreover, resource templates allow developers to define constraints based on costs, component proximity, and geographical distribution.

Migration and Deployment Recipes:

Deployment recipes are an important ingredient for automation in the meta cloud infrastructure. Such recipes allow for controlled deployment of the application, including installing packages, starting required services, managing package and application parameters, and establishing links between related components. Automation tools such as Opscode Chef provide an extensive set of functionalities that are directly integrated into the meta cloud environment.

Migration recipes go one step further and describe how to migrate an application during runtime — for example, migrate storage functionality from one service provider to another. Recipes only describe initial deployment and migration; the provisioning strategy and the meta cloud proxy execute the actual process using the aforementioned automation tools.

Meta Cloud Proxy:

The meta cloud provides proxy objects, which are deployed with the application and run on the provisioned cloud resources. They serve as mediators between the application and the cloud provider. These proxies expose the meta cloud API to the application, transform application requests into cloud-provider-specific requests, and forward them to the respective cloud services. Proxies provide a way to execute deployment and migration recipes triggered by the meta cloud's provisioning strategy. Moreover, proxy objects send QoS statistics to the resource monitoring component running within the meta cloud.

The meta cloud obtains the data by intercepting the application's calls to the underlying cloud services and measuring their processing time, or by executing short benchmark programs. Applications can also define and monitor custom QoS metrics that the proxy objects send to the resource monitoring component to enable advanced, application-specific management strategies. To avoid high load and computational bottlenecks, communication between proxies and the meta cloud is kept at a minimum. Proxies don't run inside the meta cloud, and regular service calls from the application to the proxy aren't routed through the meta cloud, either.

Resource Monitoring:

On an application's request, the resource monitoring component receives data collected by meta cloud proxies about the resources they're using. The component filters and processes these data and then stores them on the knowledge base for further processing. This helps generate comprehensive QoS information about cloud service providers and the particular services they provide, including response time, availability, and more service-specific quality statements.

Provisioning Strategy:

The provisioning strategy component primarily matches an application's cloud service requirements to actual cloud service providers. It finds and ranks cloud services based on data in the knowledge base. The initial deployment decision is based on the resource templates, specifying the resource requirements of an application, together with QoS and pricing information about service providers. The result is a list of possible cloud service combinations ranked according to expected QoS and costs. At runtime, the component can reason about whether migrating a resource to another resource provider is beneficial based on new insights into the application's behavior and updated cloud provider QoS or pricing data. Reasoning about migrating also involves calculating migration costs. Decisions about the provisioning strategy result in the component executing customer-defined deployment or migration scripts.

Knowledge Base:

The knowledge base stores data about cloud provider services, their pricing and QoS, and information necessary to estimate migration costs. It also stores customer-provided resource templates and migration or deployment recipes. The knowledge base indicates which cloud providers are eligible for a certain customer. These usually comprise all providers the customer has an account with and providers that offer possibilities for creating (sub)accounts on the fly. Several information sources contribute to the knowledge base: meta cloud proxies regularly send data about application behavior and cloud service QoS. Users can add cloud service providers' pricing and capabilities manually or use crawling techniques that can get this information automatically.

A Meta Cloud Use Case:

Let's come back to the sports application use case. A meta-cloud-compliant variant of this application accesses cloud services using the meta cloud API and doesn't directly talk to the cloud-provider-specific service APIs. For our particular case, this means the application doesn't depend on Amazon EC2, SQS, or RDS service APIs, but rather on the meta cloud's compute, message queue, and relational database service APIs. For initial deployment, the developer submits the application's resource template to the meta cloud. It specifies not only the three types of cloud services needed to run the sports application, but also their necessary properties and how they depend on each other. For compute resources, for instance, the developer can specify CPU, RAM, and disk space according to terminology defined by the meta cloud resource template DSL. Each resource can be named in the template, which allows for referencing during deployment, runtime, and migration. The resource template specification should also contain interdependencies, such as the direct connection between the Web service compute instances and the message queue service. The rich information that resource templates provide helps the provisioning strategy component make profound decisions about cloud service ranking.

We can explain the working principle for initial deployment with a Web search analogy, in which resource templates are queries and cloud service provider QoS and pricing information represent indexed documents. Algorithmic aspects of the actual ranking are beyond this article's scope. If some resources in the resource graph are only loosely coupled, then the meta cloud will be more likely to select resources from different cloud providers for a single application. In our use case, however, we assume that the provisioning strategy ranks the respective Amazon cloud services first, and that the customer follows this recommendation. After the resources are determined, the meta cloud deploys the application, together with an instance of the meta cloud proxy, according to customer-provided recipes. During runtime, the meta cloud proxy mediates between the application components and the Amazon cloud resources and sends monitoring data to the resource monitoring component running within the meta cloud. Monitoring data helps refine the application's resource template and the provider's overall QoS values, both stored in the knowledge base. The provisioning strategy component regularly checks this updated information, which might trigger a migration.

The meta cloud could migrate front-end nodes to other providers to place them closer to the application's users, for example. Another reason for a migration might be updated pricing data. After a price cut by Rackspace, for example, services might migrate to its cloud offerings. To make these decisions, the provisioning strategy component must consider potential migration costs regarding time and money.

The actual migration is performed based on customer-provided migration recipes. Working on the meta cloud, we face the following technical challenges. Resource monitoring must collect and process data describing different cloud providers' services such that the provisioning strategy can compare and rank their QoS properties in a normalized, provider independent fashion.

Although solutions for deployment in the cloud are relatively mature, application migration isn't as well supported. Finding the balance between migration facilities provided by the meta cloud and the application is particularly important. Cloud-centric migration makes the meta cloud infrastructure responsible for most migration aspects, leading to issues with application specific intricacies, whereas in application-centric migration, the meta cloud only triggers the migration process, leaving its execution mostly to the application. We argue that the meta cloud should control the migration process but offer many interception points for applications to influence the process at all stages.

The provisioning strategy — the most integrative component, which derives strategies mainly based on input from runtime monitoring and resource templates and effects them by executing migration and deployment recipes — requires further research into combining approaches from the information retrieval and autonomic computing fields. The meta cloud can help mitigate vendor lock-in and promises transparent use of cloud computing services.

Most of the basic technologies necessary to realize the meta cloud already exist, yet lack integration. Thus, integrating these state-of-the-art tools promises a huge leap toward the meta cloud. To avoid meta cloud lock in, the community must drive the ideas and create a truly open meta cloud with added value for all customers and broad support for different providers and implementation technologies.

References:

1. M. Armbrust et al., "A View of Cloud Computing," *Comm. ACM*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2010, pp. 50–58.
2. B.P. Rimal, E. Choi, and I. Lumb, "A Taxonomy and Survey of Cloud Computing Systems," *Proc. Int'l Conf. Networked Computing and Advanced Information Management*, IEEE CS Press, 2009, pp. 44–51.
3. J. Skene, D.D. Lamanna, and W. Emmerich, "Precise Service Level Agreements," *Proc. 26th Int'l Conf. Software Eng. (ICSE 04)*, IEEE CS Press, 2004, pp. 179–188.
4. Q. Zhang, L. Cheng, and R. Boutaba, "Cloud Computing: State-of-the-Art and Research Challenges," *J. Internet Services and Applications*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2010, pp. 7–18.
5. M.D. Dikaiakos, A. Katsifodimos, and G. Pallis, "Minersoft: Software Retrieval in Grid and Cloud Computing Infrastructures," *ACM Trans. Internet Technology*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2012, pp. 2:1–2:34.

About Authors:

1.Konduru Bhuvaneshwari She Was Born In Ojili Rachapalem [V], Ojili [M], S.P.S.R.Nellore [Dt], Andhra Pradesh, India. She Received The B.Tech Degree In Information Technology From Jnt University, Anantapur In 2013 And Pursuing M.Tech Degree In Software Engineering From Jnt University, Anantapur. She Completed Her B.Tech Degree In Narayana Engineering College, Dhurjati Nagar, Gudur [T] [M], S.P.S.R.Nellore [Dt], Andhra Pradesh And M.Tech Degree In Skr College Of Engineering & Technology, Konduru Satram [V], Manubolu [M], S.P.S.R.Nellore [Dt], Andhra Pradesh, India.

2.Mr. Syed Baji He Was Born In Andhra Pradesh, India. He Received The Bachelor Of Computer Applications Degree From Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapur In 1998-2001 And Master Of Science In Information Technology From Bharath Institute Of Science & Technology, Madras University, Chennai In 2001-2003 And Master Of Technology In Information Technology From Bharath Institute Of Higher Education & Research From Bharath University, Chennai In 2003-2005. He Has 10 Years Experience In The Field Of Associate Professor And Hod In Dept .Of Cse & It. He Had Working As Associate Professor And P.G Co-Ordinator In Dept. Of Software Engineering In Skr College Of Engineering & Technology, Konduru Satram [V], Manubolu [M], S.P.S.R Nellore [Dt], Andhra Pradesh, India.