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ABSTRACT
Evolutions in web technologies have enabled more and more applications to be deployed in the Cloud leading to the increasing adoption of multitenancy. Multitenant systems can share one application instance across many tenants and clients distributed over multiple devices. These systems need to manage the shared knowledge base reused by the various users and applications they support. Rather than hard-coding all the shared knowledge and ontologies, developers often encode this knowledge in the form of rules to program server-side business logic. In such situations, a modern inference engine can be used to accommodate the knowledge for tenants of a multitenant web system.

Existing inference engines, however, were not conceptually designed to support and to cope with the knowledge of the rules of multiple applications and clients at the same time. They are not fit for multitenant web systems since one has to manually hard-code the modularity of the knowledge for the various applications and clients, which quickly becomes complex and failible.

We present Serena, a middleware supporting multitenant reactive web applications. Serena augments an event-driven web server with a Rete-based inference engine. The distinctive feature of Serena is the notion of reentrancy and scoping in its inference engine, which is the key solution in making it multitenant. We validate our work through a simulated case study and a comparison with a similar common-place web server with a Rete-based inference engine constituting a multitenant system. To this end, we have augmented an event-driven web server with a traditional inference engine constituting Serena, a rule-based multitenant middleware. This enables us to realise the computationally-intensive process of receiving and reactively processing data in order to detect complex events, together with accompanying data relevant to notify clients. In Serena clients can install logic reactive rules that define the complex events they are interested in and dynamically upload data. The rules specify which data to match, who to notify and what information is sent with the notify-
Conventionally, inference engines were not conceptually designed to work in the multitenant environment. These rule-based systems (such as production systems [22]) are intrinsically non-reentrant: they are characterised by a flat design space where activations could be observed from all asserted facts without discriminating their sources. Further distinctions between clients and their data sources need to be hard-coded within the rules, which quickly become complex and fallible as the number of clients and the relationships between them increase, or when the relationships become complex to enforce using rule semantics. In a multitenant application, failure to properly make these distinctions can cause unintended rule activations in other clients. Inference engines therefore require orchestration within rules to discriminate or distinguish between instances of different entities. The Serena middleware provides techniques for users and developers to specify scoped rules that detect patterns in real-time data and to realise grouping structures in knowledge-intensive multitenant applications.

Scoped rules enable rule creators to distinguish between events pertaining to different clients, while keeping this logic cleanly separated from the application logic. As such, the basic purpose of the rule is not muddled with the logic required for distinguishing clients. This leaves the logical intent of a rule easy to understand for a rule creator. At the same time, scoping enables us exploit a number of performance optimizations in the server’s inference engine during the matching process. Our approach of encoding the physical, structural or other logical organizations of multitenant applications eases the computational workload of the inference algorithm, thereby decreasing the engine’s overall response time.

In brief, the main contributions in this work are:

- A reactive, rule-based middleware for multitenant architectures supporting knowledge-based applications (Section 3)
- An extension to the rule-based syntax in the middleware to support scope-based reasoning in multitenant systems (Section 4.3)
- An extension to the rule-based syntax in the middleware to support scope-based reasoning in multitenant systems (Section 4.3)

We begin by introducing the motivation and proceed to enumerate some requirements in Section 2. We then present Serena middleware and its architecture in Section 3. Next we discuss the scoping mechanism in Section 4. We penultimately evaluate our approach in Section 5 and finally discuss the related work in Section 6 and the conclusion and future work in Section 7.

## 2. DATA-DRIVEN MULTITENANCY

In this section we motivate the need for a data-driven solution in a multitenant inference engine. To highlight the requirements that such a system should meet, we present a scenario of a service provider in the Cloud for monitoring security systems, similar to a Cloud Access Security Broker (CASB) [10]. In this case, the provider is a service that monitors and logs requests in a university-wide security access system.

In brief, the main contributions in this work are:

1. A reactive, rule-based middleware for multitenant architectures supporting knowledge-based applications (Section 3)
2. An extension to the rule-based syntax in the middleware to support scope-based reasoning in multitenant systems (Section 4.3)

We begin by introducing the motivation and proceed to enumerate some requirements in Section 2. We then present Serena middleware and its architecture in Section 3. Next we discuss the scoping mechanism in Section 4. We penultimately evaluate our approach in Section 5 and finally discuss the related work in Section 6 and the conclusion and future work in Section 7.

### 2.1 Motivating Example: University Services Access Control

Universities in Brussels have passed a resolution that requires monitoring accesses of students and staff all over their campuses and report access requests that deviate from policies in place. The universities have installed proximity ID-card scanners at most major access points, and students/staff scan their issued ID cards to gain access to various locations in the campuses. Some of the security monitoring policies that the security team design are illustrated below:

1. All students at all levels have access to classrooms during class times on weekdays
2. Only registered student and staff cars are allowed entry to underground parking on their campuses
3. External staff are allowed access only if they have a pre-authorised access code, issued by higher level administrative staff
4. Biology department students are allowed access to all labs in the (sub)departments in the weekends if accompanied by senior academic staff
5. Only campus bank employees and consultants have access to the bank back office during working hours

For this scenario, we have enumerated around 40 security access policies. The final model of the contains 3 universities and 61 faculty, administrative and physical groupings –
with students, staff and devices belonging to one or multiple
groups. Whenever an access request is made by a student
or staff the security system of the university sends the data
to the monitoring service. According to the policies defined,
the service logs the request, computes whether the access is
within the defined security policies and displays the results
in a dashboard. For instance in policy 1, when a student on
a university accesses a classroom during class times the mon-
itoring dashboard would show a status to indicate whether
the access is acceptable or otherwise.

2.2 Requirements

The security monitoring service is an representative ex-
ample of a reactive multitenant application. We particularly
target the dynamic design of knowledge-intensive, data-driven
applications that continuously stream data back and forth
between clients and the server. Accordingly, we exclude mul-
tenant service compositions and static workflow systems as
most approaches are process-driven and deviate from these
targets. The scenario illustrates some of the requirements
that such multitenant middleware should satisfy:

- **Data-driven middleware for instantaneous processing of
  intermittent data streams** – The middleware should be re-
sponsive to new inputs sent by tenants by processing them
in real-time or near real-time fashion allowing the end-user
application to react to the data. For instance, in the mo-
tivating example, the monitoring service provider should
be able to process access requests from a large number of
clients and devices promptly according to custom policies
to provide immediate feedback.

- **Runtime support for the definition and real-time detection
  of customisable constraints** – The middleware should re-
duce the complexity of writing code that can efficiently
detect real-time events from a continuous stream given a
large number of criteria or constraints. This is a challenge
to system developers because the intent of the developer is
transcended by the accidental complexity [5] of the imple-
mentation. In the example, the university security should
be able to easily express and upload their own current and
future policy constraints for detection of access violations
using an expressive syntax.

- **Metadata architecture for multitenant partitioning** – The
middleware should be able to model the structures of ten-
ants and possible compositions or relationships between
them dynamically through metadata definitions that will
discriminate or partition the data residing in the multi-
tenant system. This implies that the internal structures of
tenants should be reflected in the runtime in order for it
to process the requests within the confines of each client’s
configuration: in this case the policies of each university.
In addition, the internal model should be able to support
other software applications from other tenants e.g., other
institutions or businesses.

- **Support for concurrent, push-based communications with
  tenants** – Modern multitenant applications need to be able
to handle a number of persistent client connections to re-
actively send data and to receive feedback. For web de-
velopers manually configuring and integrating communica-
tion between the server and the clients takes consider-
able effort through a multitude of standalone, highly spe-

Figure 2: Architecture of the Serena server middleware –
The event manager receives events and sends notifications from
the inference engine.

3. SUPPORTING DATA-DRIVEN
MULTITENANCY WITH SERENA

We present the Serena middleware which 1) eases the dy-
namic definition of requirements by utilizing a rule-based
approach, 2) efficiently processes intermittent data giving
instantaneous feedback by incorporating a forward-chaining
inference engine, and 3) flexibly supports multitenancy by
adopting concepts from group theory to model tenant struc-
tures. Serena also manages sending messages between the
server and its tenants by abstracting the underlying infra-
structure that supports push-based communication. We dis-
sect the inner workings of the Serena middleware by first
illustrating its architecture and we later explain its execu-
tion semantics.

3.1 Serena Architecture

The architecture of Serena is illustrated in Figure 2. The
middleware connects clients to the server by means of bi-
directional websockets. The middleware server is written as
a Node.js package that consists of five main components:

- **The Working Memory** contains the data store that col-
  lects and maintains fact assertions from activations and
events.

- **The Inference Engine** is the heart of the Serena middle-
  ware, and resides on the multitenant server. It serves as the
  interpreter for the rules, evaluating received data according
to the rules. It is composed of 3 submodules:

  - **The Rete graph builder** receives the rules from the rules
    repository, parses the rules, and builds the data flow graph
    based on a modified Rete algorithm [13] augmented with
    scopes.

  - **The matching component** is tasked with finding consistent
    bindings in the working memory. Facts can be matched
    when the conditions of the rules are satisfied. Scope con-
    straints are checked using an encoded representation of
    the structure of the tenants. The matching component
    builds an instantiation or activation for every set of facts
    that satisfy a rule and places them in the queue of the
    activation scheduler.
The activation scheduler takes the set of all rule instantiations and executes or fires them given an activation strategy.

The Rules Repository is tasked with the responsibility of storing rules, and therefore manages the addition and removal of rules from the tenants. It is also involved in building the Rete graph, and in determining which rules to activation within the inference engine.

The Scoping Module internally represents the structure of the tenants, and builds an efficient encoding mechanism for scopes. This encoding affects the matching strategy in the inference engine, and is used by the event manager to determine the recipients of notifications.

The Event Manager receives and queues event data from tenants and pushes queued notifications to the correct recipients whenever a particular rule has been instantiated by the activation scheduler. It also maintains the connection sessions between the tenants and the client library.

On the client side Serena provides a library that initialises and maintains the (re)connections to the server middleware. It further manages sending of messages and reception of notifications pushed from the server through the Event Manager.

3.2 Serena Execution Runtime

The Serena middleware runtime is based on one of the most the widely-used models of knowledge representation known as the production systems model [22]. The distinguishing feature of production systems is the use of data-sensitive rules rather than sequenced instructions as the basis of computation.

Rule-based systems usually consist of a number of unordered rules referencing a global working memory. Similarly native multitenant architectures serve multiple clients that share a dedicated instance, accessing global resources. To support and cope with the knowledge of rules applicable to multiple clients and applications, inference engines and multitenant architectures require features for structural decomposition at the application level. Both models can benefit from modular design and structural abstractions as the systems they support grow in size and complexity.

We outline how the Serena middleware embraces this approach, exemplified using the example scenario. We first begin by explaining the semantics of rules in Serena.

3.2.1 Rule-based syntax

The university policies from the scenario in Section 2.1 can be easily expressed in a rule-based format. We illustrate such a rule to be added by a university security staff using a customised Javascript JSON Rules [14] syntax in Listing 1 for the classroom policy 1. The rule object can be generated from a web-based graphical UI for intuitive rule definitions.

Listing 1: Rule for classtime access

```json
{ "ruleset": "classtime-access",
  "conditions": {
    "$s": { "type": "student", "name": "?name" },
    "$d": { "type": "accessdevice", "name": "?dev",
      "location": "classroom" },
    "type": "accessreq",
    "id": "?reqid",
    "person": "?name",
    "time": "?t",
    "device": "?dev"
  },
  "actions": {
    "assert": { "type": "accessrep", "reqid": "?reqid",
      "allowed": true } } }```

![Rete Graph](image)

A rule consists of a name, the left-hand side (LHS) with conditions for event detection, and a right-hand side (RHS) for a reaction after detection. The LHS of the definition (lines 2-6) captures the access request from a person on a proximity device within the specified time periods (line 6). In the rule the ‘?’ operator denotes a variable binding (e.g. ?name in lines 3 & 5). When all the conditions specified in the LHS are satisfied, then the actions defined in the RHS are activated. Here, we assert that the access request has been granted (line 9).

In Serena clients can dynamically add rules to the multitenant server through the middleware’s client library. The rules are appended to the existing inference engine’s graph and define the real-time detection constraints for that client. In general, the inference engine will process and detect any events that clients are interested in and once activated will notify the relevant client(s). As we show in Section 4.5, a client provides a handler that will be invoked once the rule has been activated.

Such rules are then added into the inference engine. Inference engines perform pattern-matching, a technique that reasons over the data to detect constraints that need to be fulfilled. Most current inference engines are based on the Rete algorithm [13]. Rete compiles rules (such as the one in Listing 1) into a data-flow graph that filters facts (data) as they propagate through nodes performing the actual matching process through the match-execute cycle. The matching process searches for consistent bindings between the facts and the existing rules. Efficient matching is achieved through exploiting 1) structural similarity – sharing of the nodes when building the graph, and 2) temporal redundancy – caching of intermediate matched data tokens between cycles of incoming results, at the price of higher memory usage.

3.2.2 The Rete Algorithm

In Figure 3 we show the Rete graph built in Serena after addition of the classtime-access rule from Listing 1. Facts enter the graph from the root node. In the upper alpha
network, single-input alpha nodes perform generated type selection and intra-condition tests with an alpha memory node holding the results. The leftmost alpha node student filters facts of that type and stores them in its alpha memory.

The beta network is built in the lexical order of the condition elements forming a left-associative binary tree. Two-input beta nodes perform inter-condition tests or join operations on their left and right inputs according to the corresponding conditions. A beta memory is associated with each beta node and holds the intermediate join results. The leftmost beta node in Figure 3 performs joins for a student’s name and the name of the person performing the access request, creates a token of both facts in the result and sends it to the next node. It also serves as left input for successive nodes in the beta network. The second beta node receives the token and performs joins of facts from a proximity device with the device of the access request. For any beta node the right input is always an alpha memory node.

The final beta node in a condition sequence represents the full activation of a rule and is named a terminal node. In this case the rule class time-access will be instantiated once a token reaches this node.

The Need for Reentrancy.

In Rete rules are technically shared in their entirety within the network. Structural similarity promotes sharing of nodes performing the same test but corresponding to different rules.

We stated in the previous section that clients can add rules dynamically using the Serena middleware. Adding rules in a multitenant setting is not, however, without its risks when using the naive approach of having a single inference engine on the multitenant server (Figure 4 (a)) for all tenants. For example, a separate client in another university can develop a rule similar to the one in Listing 1. This will reuse the same graph and as a result both universities receiving notifications of access granted in their dashboards whenever a student in either university enters a classroom: an undesirable result.

The common solution provided by most other engines (as discussed in Section 6) is to spawn a separate engine instance or module for each tenant or client (Figure 4(b)). This resolves the problems of unintended and spurious activations, but at the cost of undermining the strengths of the Rete algorithm. By defying the two main tenets of Rete – structural similarity and temporal redundancy – match time and memory usage rapidly increase.

A more involving approach would require that every rule from tenants have additional discriminatory conditions. This however increases rule complexity, becomes tedious, and hides the rule’s logical intent by trying to manually enforce discrimination within the rules of all current and future tenants. It also impacts the resulting Rete network: additional join nodes are created, as we show in the next subsection.

Support for multiple tenants can be improved by making the Rete algorithm reentrant such that it can purely handle multiple inference states simultaneously for different sets of client rules, as illustrated in Figure 4(c).

Reentrant Rete.

In order to enforce multitenancy during the inference engine’s match cycles, it imperative that an efficient representation be used to represent the hierarchy and to quickly determine the relationships between the data being processed at runtime. To elaborate using Figure 3, an access request that is asserted reaches the second join node causing a left activation. This will initiate a scan on the entire alpha memory for its right input, to find compatible access devices for a request. Furthermore, in a multitenant setup the scan performs an additional “is the token’s request that we want to match with the access device originating from the same university?”-check from the same alpha memory of the beta node 2 (depicted in Figure 5 as the join test in brackets – usually this check will result in a separate join node, which we omit here for the sake of clarity). This check tries to find a consistent binding for a device of the same exact university to avoid unintended activations with data from other tenants. The same check is also performed when facts from a different tenant are asserted into the monitoring service.

The numbers of these checks increase markedly when the multitenant inference engine supports relationships within and between tenants. For instance, policy 4 from the motivating example specified that students from a department in the university can have special access times to their departmental labs. The resulting Rete graph for the policy is shown in Figure 6, which results in more join tests and join nodes.

As identified in [21], a major bottleneck in Rete and a number of its variants is such combinatorial join tests. Therefore the group representation needs to be able to perform these checks in a zealously efficient manner. We next show the direction that Serena takes to solve this.

4. SCOPING THE INFERENCE ENGINE

Serena’s approach is to embrace the concepts of physical or
4.1 Group Representation of Tenant Structures

Serena models groups internally with the aim of using these representations to enforce data discrimination in the inference engine. Serena rules can therefore be applicable to a single tenant, to multiple (individual) tenants or to a group of tenants.

We describe a structural representation that uses the notion of a group as a primitive. We showed in Figure 1 how we can conceptually structure the tenants and subtenants into the monitoring service in groups and subgroups. Serena represents the group hierarchy as an acyclic graph with the groups as the nodes with the clients connected to different groups at different levels in the graph.

One characteristic is that groups usually have an aspect of relationships between them – research groups can belong to (sub)departments, hobbies can be categorised into hierarchies of interest groups and sensor area zones can be contained in levels of administrative units. We therefore appropriate the term scopes to represent the common relationships between groups in the hierarchy and designate that as a scope hierarchy.

Serena adds scopes as (a series of) edges in the group hierarchy. Serena supports the following scope operations shown in Figure 7 on the tenant groups.

- **visibleto**: In this scope we only capture data from clients in groups that share at least one parent with the specified group. An example is capturing the data that pertains to senior academic researchers collaborating with other personnel within the same university (Figure 7a). Another example is capturing data from the same university as the

Figure 6: Policy 4 Rete graph with departmental checks – To discriminate data from different clients additional tests are needed.

Figure 7: Scopes supported in Serena – The scopes shown are in relation to the group hierarchy from Figure 1 specific bioinformatics department, excluding data from other universities.

- **peerof**: Only data items that originate from peers will be considered in this scope. The peers include groups that are at the same level in the hierarchy. For instance a researcher would want to create a rule with this scope that applies to members in computer science and biology departments. The peerof scope is depicted in Figure 7b.

- **subgroupof**: Only the data items added by the group or any of its subgroups are included in the scope. This scope is ideal for a departmental rule for computer science that will only apply to members of that department or sub-departments (web info systems and software engineering). See Figure 7c. Its dual is subgroupof.

- **private**: The private scope will exclusively source data from the specified group and none else (not even its subgroups or parent group). This scope is well suited for data that applies to an exact group, like in Figure 7d where we
can target ID scanning devices that are specifically at the campus entrances and not those in its subgroups such as the campus parking.

- **public**: Here we capture all data from all defined groups in the hierarchy. The universities could, for example, collaborate in sharing security information between them so they can be interested in data from the devices/students/staff in all the groups and their subgroups. The public scope is depicted in Figure 7.

4.2 Encoding the Tenant Group Hierarchy

To enforce reentrancy and to efficiently process the various scopes within the match-execute cycle of the inference engine, the Serena middleware internally converts the scopes discussed in Section 4.1 into a more efficient encoding. Our vision is to use an encoding method that rather than performing computationally expensive scope checks such as path traversals in a hierarchical structure, performs (near) constant-time operations to entirely determine data relationships in the structure. This is vital because during the match-execute cycle, Rete performs combinatorial processing in its join nodes as the dataset increases: therefore tenant group path traversals will dramatically affect the performance per cycle.

The basic idea is that we precompute the scope check, store and maintain them efficiently as an encoding that will be used to expeditiously process scope constraints.

We base our encoding on the *transitive closure*, a significant component modelling most relationships in knowledge and representation systems as identified in [1] that makes our encoding suitable for querying binary relationships – precisely the kinds of operations that the inference engine performs when performing a scope check between left and right inputs. We next outline the encoding process.

The Group Hierarchy as a Poset – Initially, Serena captures the hierarchy as a poset. The example hierarchy in Figure 1 can be represented as a poset \((P, \leq)\) with the binary relation \(\leq\) defined as ‘is a part of’ \(^1\). In the poset \(P\) have an element \((a,b)\) if \(a\) is part of \(b\), so elements include (junior, academic), (bioinformatics, biology), (internal, personnel) and (computer science, science dept). With \(P\) we can perform well-defined operations such as bounds (LUB, GLB) and extrema (maximals, minimals) \(^1\). For instance the maximals in the group hierarchy of Figure 1 are physical, research and personnel. Even so, when processing poset operations the engine would still have to traverse the elements of the poset recursively.

The Groups as a Lattice – We can convert the groups poset to a lattice \(L\) as outlined in Appendix A.2. This leads to the hierarchy depicted as the hasse diagram in Figure 8. Other distinct hierarchies can have their own top-level element same as \(T\). A lattice represents the group hierarchy in a form that is more efficient to encode and compute than the earlier poset representation.

Encoding the Lattice – With \(L\), Serena performs a customised *bit-vector encoding* method outlined in Appendix C that is based on the method by Atit-Kaci \([2]\). The result is a binary matrix encoding \(M_{\theta}\) of the group hierarchy, shown in Figure 9 for our example, with the following properties:

1) The labels on the rows of \(M\) represent the groups in

\(^1\)For definitions, see Appendix A.1

\(^2\)In most cases the general \(\leq\) relation ‘is subgroup of’ suffices

- **visibleto** – To perform a scope check of a visibleto \(b\) the middleware checks if the result of \(M_{\theta}(a, b) \land M_{\theta}(b, s)\) is a maximal in \(M\) as per property (iv).

- **peerof** – To check if a peerof \(b\) it calculates if \(Level(a) = Level(b)\) from the process of encoding \(M_{\theta}\).

- **subgroupof** – A scope check of a subgroupof \(b\) is true if the result of \(M_{\theta}(a, s) \land M_{\theta}(b, s) = M_{\theta}(b, s)\) as per property (ii). Conversely, \(b\) is a subgroupof \(a\).
• **private** – To find out if a private b it can check if $M_{\theta(a, \ast)} \wedge M_{\theta(b, \ast)} = M_{\theta(a, \ast)}$ as per property (ii) and (iii).

• **public** – For a scope check of a public b then middleware calculates if $M_{\theta(a, \ast)} \wedge M_{\theta(T, \ast)} = M_{\theta(T, \ast)}$ as per properties (ii) and (i).

With these operations, the middleware can perform scope operations efficiently. It retrieves the values in the matrix and performs binary operations (as defined in Appendix C) from the encoding in near-constant time.

### 4.3 Defining Scoped Rules

The Serena middleware allows clients to upload rules to the server. To expose scoped rule definitions, Serena follows a similar direction as Allen’s work in [3] that proposes rule extensions for temporal interval constraints. Similarly, we present scope-based constraints by extending the normal rule syntax with scope-based definitions that specify structural constraints on the groups and the relationships between them, which we simply call scopes. The scopes supported are as in Section 4.1.

We illustrate with an example. We show how to define policy 4 of biology students lab accesses in the weekends from Section 2.1 using scope constraints in Listing 2.

#### Listing 2: Rule for biology dept. weekend lab access

```plaintext
1 {rulename: "biology.weekend.access",
2 conditions: {
3 {stfu: {type: "student", name: "?stuname"}},
4 {stff: {type: "staff", name: "?stfname"}},
5 {sd: {type: "accessdevice", name: "?dev"},
6 location: "labs")},
7 {type: "accessreq", id: "?reqid1", person: 
8 "?stuname", time: "?t1", device: "?dev"},
9 {type: "accessreq", id: "?reqid2", person: 
10 "?stfname", time: "?t2", device: "?dev"},
11 {type: "test", expr: "(hourBetween(?t1, 8, 20) &
12 (isWeekend(?t1, ?t2) == true) &
13 isNear(?t1, ?t2))"},
14 scopes: [
15 "biology supergroupof (stu & stf & dev),
16 stf private senior >
17 "stf private senior"],
18 actions: {
19 {assert: {type: "accessreq", reqid: "?reqid1",
20 allowed: true}}
21 },
22 notify: ["subgroup of administrative"]
23 }
```

The rule is similar to Listing 1, with an additional scopes section (line 10) where the bound condition variables in line 3, 4, and 5 are referenced to check whether the student, staff and device facts are all tagged to belong to the biology department or its subdepartments using the scope check supergroup of. The & operator makes it easier to define multiple scope constraint checks in one line. The additional scope check in line 10 enforces the constraint that the staff member has to be in the senior academic group. The rule will therefore detect the constraints of policy 4, which was to capture lab accesses made in the weekends by a student that is accompanied by a senior academic staff member in the biology department and any of its subdepartments.

### 4.4 Scoped Constraints in the Rete Graph

Within the inference engine, the rule in Listing 2 will be built as shown in Figure 10. The main difference is in the

![Figure 10: The scoped Rete graph for policy 4 – The expensive tests are replaced with scope tests performed by efficient encoding operations](image-url)

Similar operations are performed for this supergroup check and the next private scope check for the senior staff member from the academic personnel group using $M_{\theta}$.

### 4.5 Scoped Notifications

Eventually, once the security access is granted then the effect should be logged and displayed on the the correct university’s dashboard as per the requirements of the example. One issue that arises is who to notify, and specifically, which group of which tenant should receive the notification.

With the matrix encoding, Serena can support advanced notification mechanisms whenever a scoped rule has been activated. We refer back to Listing 2 where Serena rules expose a notify construct in line 14 that specifies the groups to notify once the rule is fired. The notification scopes are similar to the matching scopes but in this case they can enforce notification constraints to a group, subgroup, or direct clients. Furthermore, Serena invokes similar binary operations as in Section 4.2 to determine the groups to notify as when performing a scope check during matching.

To illustrate, the notify construct of the rule in Listing 2 will notify members of administrative group and its subgroups. The notify will invoke code in the clients that provide a callback registered in the onRuleActivated construct provided by the Serena middleware client library. With the supergroup of administrative scope notification defini-
tion Serena checks the entry \( M^\_\text{rule}(\text{administrative}) \) and notifies clients in the groups which have an entry of 1 which in this case is only the clients of the group administrative.

We next show client code for receiving notifications using JavaScript syntax in a web application. Initially the client headofsecurity connects to the server middleware (providing the name and groups s/he belongs) in line 1 of Listing 3. In line 3 we add a rule and the acknowledgement callback to be invoked after it has been added to the server. The client also specifies code that will be executed whenever a notification for a scoped rule is detected, with the arguments of the rulename, the facts and the client that added rule (line 6). The interface of the client headofsecurity can thus be updated with the information from the facts that activated the rule in line 9, which shows the staff, student and access request that has been granted.

Listing 3: Adding a Serena client rule and notification

```javascript
var serena = new SerenaClient('server.net',
    'headofsecurity', 'administrative');
var rule4 = // json rule 'biology_weeked_access' here
serena.addRule(rule4, function(err, result){
    // rule was added
    serenaClient.onRuleActivated(
        function(rulename, facts, source){
            // rule was fired
            updateDashBoard(facts);
        });
});
```

5. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section we evaluate our approach with the University Services Access Control scenario detailed in Section 2.1. We focus on the investigating whether the scoping metadata architecture within the inference engine as presented has significant computational benefits over a traditional inference engine.

5.1 Setup & Methodology

The example scenario was implemented as a simulation running on an event-driven web server. The final application has a total of 61 groups in hierarchies, 39 access rules, and 73 concurrent clients across 3 sample universities. All clients are connected to the multitenant server concurrently through websocket connections managed by the middleware. The server runs Node.js and has an AMD Opteron Processor 6272 at 2.1Ghz. The maximum RAM allocated to the Node.js simulation was 20GB.

We categorised the general simulation setup into two: one with traditional rules having expression tests to enforce data discrimination (unscoped), and another with Serena’s scoped rules using the Serena middleware. Following random assignment experimental design we generated access requests from clients in both categories concurrently through the expensive combinatorial join operations in the engine. The unscoped approach spent more time processing the expensive combinatorial join operations in the engine. The scoped engine’s scope tests use the encoding, leading to better performance, and consequently to a higher number of activations recorded (by approximately 31%) within the same simulation run.

The aggregated results in Figure 13 show evidence of a better overall performance of the scoped engine. Compared to a traditional approach, Serena on average improves the computation of scope tests and total memory consumption, increasing the average number of rule activations of all randomised simulation runs.

5.2 Results & Discussion

Figure 11 shows the cumulative number of join tests performed and rule activations from a single simulation of both scoped and unscoped engines, and in Figure 13 we calculate and chart the sample means of the observed results of all the 70 randomised simulations.

Figure 11: Results in one simulation – We compare the cumulative results of one run of 12 hours

From the graphs in Figure 11 we observe that the traditional unscoped Rete graph built from manually programming data discrimination within the rules suffers a marked increase in the number of joins computed compared to our scoped graph. The unscoped approach spent more time processing the expensive combinatorial join operations in the engine. The scoped engine’s scope tests use the encoding, leading to better performance, and consequently to a higher number of activations recorded (by approximately 31%) within the same simulation run.

The aggregated results in Figure 13 show evidence of a better overall performance of the scoped engine. Compared to a traditional approach, Serena on average improves the computation of scope tests and total memory consumption, increasing the average number of rule activations of all randomised simulation runs.

The reduced memory consumption is an interesting result.
given the matrix encoding of the hierarchy one would expect a higher memory consumption in the scoped approach. This is indeed true when we zoom in on the initial memory consumption of the single run, as illustrated in Figure 12. Eventually, however, the unscoped approach surpasses the scoped engine after about an hour of asserted facts. This is because encoding the structural organisation of the tenants and implementing scoping using metadata enables Serena to perform optimisations in the internal data structures used to tag data from clients. For example: in the traditional approach each fact would contain a dedicated group slot object, taking up the same space as other slots like name, age etc. In our approach we utilise the lattice hierarchy labels to tag the data as opposed to creating slots in facts thus saving up space occupied in each asserted fact.

6. RELATED WORK

We describe similar rule-based techniques and data-driven methods that support the development of multitenant applications focusing on preventing unnecessary duplication of processes and resources at the application level.

Decomposition in Rule-based Systems.

Modern rule engines such as Drools [25] and Jess [18] are based on the Rete algorithm as well and have their custom enhancements to the algorithm. Some of the engines have support for extensions applicable to web servers, e.g. Drools Guvnor.

Techniques that decompose larger rule bases into groups of rules in other engines all use the concept of rulebooks that consist of isolated sets of rules with no relationships between them. Examples are modules in Jess and ruleflows or event sources in Drools. Essentially these give each tenant their own Rete networks, making them fundamentally independent. Serena in contrast facilitates and encodes scoping within a single reentrant Rete network thus fully enforcing structural similarity and temporal redundancy, backed by the same knowledge base.

Schema Sharing in Databases.

A common technique to support multitenancy is by mapping the context of clients into the existing patterns of conventional databases and similar systems. These systems however lack the concept of a ‘tenant’ and thus do not offer out-of-the-box support for handling the metadata needed for multitenancy [19]. Advanced schema techniques such as Sparse Columns [6], Extension Tables [8] and Multitenant Shared Tables [15] have static and complex configurations and will degrade in performance when implemented in reactive inference engines with incremental processing.

Multitenant Middleware.

Most dedicated middleware for multitenant architectures aim to support multiple tenants at the application level using various techniques. The research in [26] and [11] achieves this through variations of the aforementioned schema sharing techniques. The SaasSAMT approach in [23] supports process-based tenant shareability based on different architectural layers. Most of the research mentioned fails in inherently supporting knowledge-based reasoning systems with incremental processing, and takes little advantage of the heterogenous nature of data in multitenant applications in their approach.

Support for application-level middleware through platforms like the Google App Engine/AppScale [27] use namespaces that partition application data across tenants. Other platforms like GigaSpaces [7] and JSR [9] use similar techniques. The platforms do not intrinsically support the flexibility and expressiveness in customizing tenant behaviour as is offered by the rule-based approach of the Serena middleware. Nevertheless, with some effort they can be utilised as foundations of its runtime.

Distributed Event-based Systems.

Distributed Event-based Systems exchange loosely-coupled data asynchronously between producers and consumers. Consumers subscribe to topics or channels of interest and receive notifications from producers. Work in [20] and [12] provide custom routing of event notifications from producers to sub-
scribed consumers. Most of existing research, however, focuses on the existence of an overlay of brokers that filter notifications before reaching the respective consumers. In contrast, scoping in Serena is primarily for improving reentrancy in the inference engine during the matching process. Furthermore, Serena provides filtering of rule notifications at the event source to connected clients, which does not require the use of a broker architecture.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We have described the Serena middleware, a system for reasoning in multitenant architectures with an inference engine based on the Rete algorithm. Our technique is useful in a number of multitenant applications to deal with the problem that much of the heterogeneous knowledge significant when performing reasoning and deductions can be structured hierarchically within a multitenant setup. The technique uses groups and common relationships between them to build an internal representation that captures the scopes present in many multitenant domains by using a hierarchy of groups. The model precisely controls the amount of deductions or computations performed automatically by the middleware as information from tenants flows into the system in a both expressive and computationally effective manner.

As future work we would like to investigate support for dynamic scopes that can be defined by the tenants during execution of the engine, thus affecting the encoding and the state of the inference engine’s intermediate memories. In addition, we observe that Rete-based inference engines experience degradation of performance and become lethargic when run for long periods of time. We are looking into ways in which the middleware can support persistence in the engine and its intermediate memories to offload antiquated data.
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APPENDIX

A. DEFINITIONS

A.1 Posets

A poset \((P, \leq)\) is a set \(P\) and a binary relation \(\leq\), such that for all \(a, b, c \in P\), the following properties always hold:

1. \(a \leq a\) (reflexivity)
2. \(a \leq b\) and \(b \leq c\) implies \(a \leq c\) (transitivity)
3. \(a \leq b\) and \(b \leq a\) implies \(a = b\) (antisymmetry)

A.1.1 Poset Operations

Bounds: Given \(A \subseteq P\), an element \(b \in P\) is called an upper bound of \(A\) if \(a \leq b\) for all \(a \in A\). \(b\) is a least upper bound or LUB if \(b \leq a\) whenever \(a\) is an upper bound of \(A\). The dual of the least upper bound is known as the greatest lower bound or GLB.

Extrema: The \(\text{maximal}\) of a poset \(P\), abbreviated \([P]\), is an element \(m \in P\) that is not greater than any other element in \(P\) according to \(\leq\). More formally,

\[
[P] = \forall b \in P, b \leq m
\]

If there is one unique maximal element in \(P\), we call it the maximum. The dual of the maximal is known as the minimal, \([P]\) and a unique minimal is known as the minimum.

A.2 Lattices

If in a poset \(P\) every pair has at least an LUB \(\land\) and a GLB \(\lor\), then the poset \(P\) becomes \((P, \leq, \land, \lor)\), a lattice \(L\). One way to transform the poset \(P\) in into a lattice is by adding a parent \(\top\) to every maximal and a child \(\bot\) to every minimal in \(P\).

A.2.1 The Covering Relation

We say for two elements \(a, b \in P\), \(a\) is covered by \(b\) if \(b\) immediately follows \(a\) in the poset ordering (i.e. \(a\) is an immediate successor of \(b\)). More formally,

\[
a < b \text{ iff } a \leq b \text{ and } \not\exists c \text{ s.t. } a \leq c \leq b, c \neq a, c \neq b
\]

This enables us to depict a lattice in a hasse diagram, where a curve goes from \(b\) to \(a\) if \(a < b\).

A.2.2 Lattice levels

In this paper we define the level of an element \(a\) in a lattice is the longest distance of \(a\) from the maximum of the lattice (in this case, \(\top\)) to the element, i.e.,

\[
Lvl(a) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{when } a \text{ has no predecessors in } P \\
\max(\{Lvl(b) | b > a\}) + 1 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

where \(>\) is the dual of \(<\).

B. OPERATIONS WITH \(\vartheta\)

Having \(L\) we can define a mapping \(\vartheta\) from \(L\) to another lattice \((S, \subseteq, \cap, \cup)\) that for every \(a, b \in L\),

\[
\vartheta(a \land b) = \vartheta(a) \cap \vartheta(b),
\]

\[
\vartheta(a \lor b) = \vartheta(a) \cup \vartheta(b).
\]

If \(\vartheta\) is invertible, then this makes it easy to calculate \(\land\) and \(\lor\). \forall a, b \in L,

\[
a \land b = \vartheta^{-1}(\vartheta(a) \cap \vartheta(b)),
\]

\[
a \lor b = \vartheta^{-1}(\vartheta(a) \cup \vartheta(b)).
\]

C. MATRIX ENCODING

We use the encoding method mentioned in 2 taking \(\vartheta\) as the transitive closure, with a modification that will enable us to map a lattice \(L\) to an encoded matrix \(M_\vartheta\).

- Instead of starting with \(\bot\), start with \(\top\) as the first element. Assign \(\vartheta(\top) = 0\).
- Move to the next elements level by level downwards in \(L\), level by level, and calculate the bitcode of each element as a vector.
- The bitcode of an element \(a \in L\) is obtained by

\[
\vartheta(a) = 2^{i-1} \lor \bigvee_{a < x} \vartheta(x) \quad (8)
\]

where \(i\) is the number of elements visited since \(\top\), and \(a < x\) are the parents of \(a\).
- An entry in the new matrix \(M_\vartheta\) for \(a\) is the reverse of the bitcode obtained by (8), without the most significant bit.

With this encoding, we can perform operations in Eq (6) and (7) having \(\land\) as the bitwise \(\text{AND}\) and \(\lor\) as bitwise \(\text{OR}\) on \(M_\vartheta\).