

# SAT Solvers and Configuration Management

## Presentation for Mancoosi Project

MATE SOOS

UPMC LIP6, PLANETE team INRIA, SALSA Team INRIA

2nd of November 2010

# Table of Contents

1 Context

2 CUDF and SAT solvers

3 Conclusions

# Outline

## 1 Context

- SAT solvers
- The Mancoosi Project

## 2 CUDF and SAT solvers

- Implementation ideas
- Why would this work?
- Why wouldn't this work?

## 3 Conclusions

# Motivations and goals

## Motivations

- Configuration management emerging problem
- SAT solvers refined tools
- Solve configuration management problems with SAT solvers

## Goals

- Show how to use SAT solvers in config. management
- Draw attention advantages&disadvantages in this context

# What is a SAT solver

Solves a problem in CNF

CNF is an “and of or-s”

$$(x_1 \vee \neg x_3) \wedge (\neg x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2)$$

Uses DPLL( $\varphi$ ) algorithm

- 1 If formula  $\varphi$  is trivial, return SAT/UNSAT
- 2  $\text{ret} = \text{DPLL}(\varphi \text{ with } v \leftarrow \text{true})$
- 3 if  $\text{ret} == \text{SAT}$ , return SAT
- 4  $\text{ret} = \text{DPLL}(\varphi \text{ with } v \leftarrow \text{false})$
- 5 if  $\text{ret} == \text{SAT}$ , return SAT
- 6 return UNSAT

# SAT solver internals

## Conflict clauses

- Generated when current assignment doesn't satisfy a clause
- Collection of information leading to conflict
- Used to avoid similar wrong parts of the tree next time

## Most important parts

- Lazy data structures
- Learning (and forgetting)
- How to pick a variable
- When to restart

## Package management in FLOSS

- Many packages
- Some conflict, some depend on others, some give same features
- Simplified to user: keep, install, upgrade, remove

## Common Upgradeability Description Format (CUDF)

- 1 Preamble with distribution-specific properties
- 2 Set of packages: dependencies, conflicts, features, properties
- 3 User request

## Solving CUDF

- Optimise for criteria: e.g. least no. changed packages
- Give best solution within time limit
- Result must satisfy dependencies, conflicts, user requests

# Outline

## 1 Context

- SAT solvers
- The Mancoosi Project

## 2 CUDF and SAT solvers

- Implementation ideas
- Why would this work?
- Why wouldn't this work?

## 3 Conclusions



# A trivial implementation

## Parser

- Parses up CUDF, optimisation criteria
- Clauses to represent *conflicts*
- Clauses to represent *dependencies*
- Clauses to express if package is real/virtual
- Clauses for user request: keep, install, upgrade, remove

## SAT solver

- Gives a solution — correct, but not optimal
- Uses multi-threading
- Keeps track of found unitary and binary truths

# A more refined implementation

## Parser

- Binary adder for optimality criteria
- Cyclicly restricts adder to smaller values
- Solves until UNSAT — optimal for a criterion
- Solution is optimal for one criterion → backtrack to previous best and optimise for next criterion

## SAT Solver

- Constant CNF file as input — contains static needs
- Plus a set of optimality constraints — changes over time
- Keeps state between SAT and SAT
- With help of Parser, some state between SAT and UNSAT

# Why would this work?

## Simplicity

- SAT solvers already optimised: no re-invent the wheel
- No need to manually multi-thread: it's in the solver
- Must express constraints simply: no repetitions

## Right tool for the job: SAT solvers

- Good at binary clauses — conflicts&dependencies create these
- Binary adders are possible to represent natively — CryptoMS patch
- Can save state between runs, no need to solve repeatedly

# Why wouldn't this work?

## Optimisation&SAT solvers

- SAT solvers not very good at optimisation
- Binary adder could get very large
- Native adder could lead to less effective learnt clauses

## Other problems

- No. variables could be huge — at least no. versioned packages
- Difficult to optimise for no repetitions: hash table expensive
- Might need to save more state than unitaries&binaries

# Outline

## 1 Context

- SAT solvers
- The Mancoosi Project

## 2 CUDF and SAT solvers

- Implementation ideas
- Why would this work?
- Why wouldn't this work?

## 3 Conclusions

# Conclusions

## Concluding remarks

- SAT is effective at many problems
- Configuration management could be one such problem
- But effort is needed

## Future work

- CryManSolver is in preparation
- It will implement the above
- Will use CryptoMiniSat as back-end

Thank you for your time

Any questions?