Local Optimizations in Eclipse QVTc and QVTr using the Micro-Mapping Model of Computation

Edward D. Willink

Willink Transformations Ltd Eclipse Foundation

MMT Component co-Lead OCL Project Lead QVTd Project Lead QVTo Committer

OMG (Model Driven Solutions)

OCL 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 RTF Chair QVT 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 RTF Chair

EXE 2016 @ MODELS 2016

3rd October 2016

Overview

- QVT Background
- Eclipse QVTd architecture
- Do things in the right order
 - imperative/declarative
- Intra-mapping scheduling
- Example results
- Eclipse QVTc/QVTr status
- Conclusion

QVT Background Query/View/Transformation

2002: standard transformation language RFP

- OMG specification slow to mature
- ATL took a pragmatic short cut
- 2005: Three language compromise
 - QVTo (Operational Mappings) Imperative
 - 2 1 good implementations : SmartQVT, Eclipse QVTo
 - QVTr (Relational) Declarative, rich
 - 2 0 poor implementations : ModelMorf, Medini QVT
 - QVTc (Core) Declarative, simple
 - notional common core, no implementations
 - Eclipse QVTd: QVTc/QVTr editors

Eclipse QVTd Tx Chain Architecture



- QVTr2QVTc nominally as in QVT specification
- \blacksquare QVTc2QVTu \Rightarrow Unidirectional (remove reverse bloat)
- \checkmark QVTu2QVTm \Rightarrow Minimal (remove refinement etc)
- \blacksquare QVTm2QVTs \Rightarrow Create graphical form
- \checkmark QVTs2QVTs \Rightarrow Optimize/schedule graphical form
- \blacksquare QVTs2QVTi \Rightarrow Imperative executable form

Correct Execution 1

- No global state => Object Orientation
- No naughty writes => Static Single Assignment
 - impractical in the large
- No naughty writes => Functional Programming
 - new system, inefficient in the large

But

- multiple threads
- complex object state
- evolving object state

Correct Execution 2

- No naughty reads
 - every property read occurs after its property write
- Functions f(a,b,c) { return a.x + g(b.y.z, c); }
 - parameters easy to analyze a, b, c
 - references hard to analyze g(b.y.z, c)
 - => secret undeclared inputs, manual discipline
- Declarative Mappings/Relations/Rules
 - same problem; global analysis necessary/possible

Imperative Transformations

- Explicit control statements
- Manual programming
 - hopefully good
 - may be bad
- Tooling
 - hopefully good
 - may be bad

Declarative Transformations

- No control statements
- Manual programming
 - different approach, may be good/bad
- Tooling
 - must discover a control strategy
 - hopefully good
 - may be VERY BAD

Naive Polling Schedule

Retry loop - loop until all work done Mapping loop - loop over all possible mappings Object loops - multi-dimensional loop for all object/argument pairings Compatibility guard - if object/argument pairings are type compatible Repetition guard - if this is not a repeated execution Validity guard - if all input objects are ready Execute mapping for given object/argument pairings Create a memento of the successful execution

- Works for any declarative transformation
- Hideously inefficient VERY VERY BAD
- Optimization goal a statically ordered schedule

Doubly Linked List Reversal Example





ATL solution

```
module Forward2Reverse;
create OUT : ReverseList from IN : ForwardList;
rule list2list {
  from
    forwardList : ForwardList!DoublyLinkedList
  to
    reverseList : ReverseList!DoublyLinkedList (
      name <- forwardList.name,</pre>
      headElement <- forwardList.headElement -- resolveTemp</pre>
rule element2element {
  from
    forwardElement : ForwardList!Element
  to
    reverseElement : ReverseList!Element (
      name <- forwardElement.name,</pre>
      list <- forwardElement.list,</pre>
                                                -- resolveTemp
      source <- forwardElement.target</pre>
                                                 -- resolveTemp
```

}

```
top relation list2list {
    enforce domain forward
        forwardList : DoublyLinkedList {
            name = listName : String{},
            headElement = forwardHead : Element{}
        };
    enforce domain reverse
        reverseList : DoublyLinkedList {
            name = listName,
            headElement = reverseHead : Element{}
        };
    when {
        element2element(forwardHead, reverseHead);
    }
}
top relation element2element {
    domain forward forwardElement : Element {
        list = forwardList : DoublyLinkedList{},
        name = elementName : String{},
        target = forwardTarget : Element{}
    };
    enforce domain reverse reverseElement : Element {
        list = reverseList : DoublyLinkedList{},
        name = elementName,
        source = reverseSource : Element{}
    };
    when {
        list2list(forwardList, reverseList);
        element2element(forwardTarget, reverseSource);
    }
ł
```

QVTr solution

Underlying (ATL) functionality





3-October-2016

Micro-Mapping Model of Computation

Made available under EPL 1.0

Mapping Diagram Artefacts



Mapping MoC



- Truth after execution
 - to-1 relationships
 - => 1:1 group of objects
 - => HEAD from which all 1:1 objects can be reached

Dependency Conflicts



Declarative Transformation Execution

- Transformation specifies numerous 'final' truths
 - relationships between output and input model elements
- Execution must proceed step by step
 - permutations of input objects that match mappings
 - compute step sequence at compile time
- Mapping
 - good / useful unit of programming
 - relevant relationships for a few types
 - bad execution step
 - deadlocks between relationships

Micro-Mapping

- Executable step in a declarative execution
 - no deadlocks between steps
- Primitive Micro-Mapping
 - many dependencies to be satisfied
 - single action object creation / property assignment
- Composite Micro-Mapping
 - merge primitives with identical dependencies
 - multiple actions

Primitive Micro-Mappings



One GREEN action at a time

once CYAN predicates satisfied

3-October-2016

Micro-Mapping Model of Computation

Made available under EPL 1.0

Speculation

- All Primitive Micro-Mappings share predicate
- Acyclic dependency resolveable at run-time
- Cyclic dependency insoluble
 - need to speculate
- defer predicates
 - ATL ignores inter-mapping predicates
 - works for typical transformations
 - Eclipse QVTd ignores predicates wrt trace creation
 - checks predicates wrt output objects/properties

Speculation Partitioning



Mapping with all dependencies



Scheduled Mapping, pruned dependencies



Made available under EPL 1.0

Overview static schedule



2 Mappings

- => 1 Root, 4 communication buffers, 8 Micro-Mappings,
 - TODO post-scheduling merge

Doubly Linked List Reversal Results



3-October-2016

Micro-Mapping Model of Computation

Made available under EPL 1.0

Eclipse QVTd Status

- 0.12.0 (Mars June 2015)
 - QVTi execution (code generated or interpreted)
- 0.13.0 (Neon June 2016)
 - preliminary QVTc / QVTr execution
 - Iow quality research only
 - no incremental / check / in-place facilities
 - no debugger
 - minimal documentation / examples
- I.0.0 (Oxygen June 2017)
 - first release functionality (? with UMLX ?)

Conclusion

- Do things in the right order
 - Mappings declare the order
 - Micro-Mappings can be ordered (graphically)
- First implementation of the QVTc specification.
- First optimized implementation of QVTr.
- First direct code generator for model transformations.
- Thirty fold speed-up.
- Many more optimizations to do.