The Grand Challenge of Trusted Components

Bertrand Meyer

ETH, Zürich
& Eiffel Software, Santa Barbara
For numerous papers and other info

http://www.inf.ethz.ch/~meyer

http://se.inf.ethz.ch
Major progress in software engineering requires switching to the systematic production and use of components of guaranteed quality.
“Most of the improvement in the reliability of computer systems has come from improvement in the basic components”

“You’ll see ever increasing portions of the effort devoted to design and verification”
The challenge

- What does it take to bring software engineering to the next level?
Software “engineering”
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Software “engineering”

- The building of quality software
Coming back from standby...
Trying to dial up...
The challenge

- What does it take to bring software engineering to the next level?
## Ways to quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A priori</strong></td>
<td>• Design methods</td>
<td>• User involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• O-O</td>
<td>• Executive support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programming language choice</td>
<td>• Education (engineers, managers...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A posteriori</strong></td>
<td>• White-box testing</td>
<td>• Testing, validation, acceptance procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Static analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proofs (of existing programs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obstacles to achieving top quality

- Industry is not interested
  (not worth the investment)
  (except security)

- Anti-intellectual attitude
  e.g. formal methods
  “Worse is better”
  Fad effects

- Academia is not that interested either
  (hard to publish)
“At a large telecommunications company, an operating division had contacted us about a project. The project manager analyzed the job and concluded that it could be done in 12 months. The customer wanted it in 9 months.

We could simply tell the customer that it couldn’t be done. Or we could agree to 9 months. After all, it was not impossible, just extremely improbable...”
The new obsession with security may be the best thing that happened to software engineering

But viewpoints are different:

- Reliability engineer: it shouldn’t crash

- Security engineer: if it crashes, we’re safe
**Good idea: Process models**

CMM, ISO...

- **Good:** force a systematic process
- **But:** concentrate on form, not substance
What makes a project successful? The original CHAOS study identified 10 success factors. No project requires all 10 factors to be successful, but the more factors, the higher the confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAOS Ten</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Involvement</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Support</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Business Objectives</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Project Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Milestones</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Basic Requirements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good idea: eXtreme Programming

“Agile” methods, refactoring, test-based development

- Good: rehabilitates the act of programming
- But: tests are not specs!
Good idea: Formal methods

B, Abstract State Machines

- Good: benefit from mathematics (IF accompanied with proofs!)

- But: expensive
Good idea: open source

GNU, Linux...

- Good: energy, enthusiasm, collaboration
- But: quality not central concern
Today’s software is often good enough

Overall:
- Works most of the time
- Doesn’t kill too many people
- Negative effects, esp. financial, are diffuse

Significant improvements since early ICSEs:
- Better languages
- Better tools
- Better practices (configuration management)
From “good enough” to good?

- Beyond “good enough”, quality is economically bad
- He who perfects, dies
The economic argument

- **Stable system:**
  - Sum of individual optima = Global optimum

- **Non-component-based development:**
  - Individual optimum = “Good Enough Software”
  - Improvements: I am responsible!

- **Component-based development:**
  - Interest of both consumer and producer: Better components
  - Improvements: Producer does the job
Quality through reuse

- The good news:

  Reuse scales up everything
Quality through reuse

- The good news:
  
  Reuse scales up everything

- The bad news:
  
  Reuse scales up everything
Trusted components

- Confluence of
  - Quality engineering
  - Reuse
“Most of the improvement in the reliability of computer systems has come from improvement in the basic components”

“You’ll see ever increasing portions of the effort devoted to design and verification”
Software design in the future

Component-based for

- Guaranteed quality
- Faster time to market
- Ease of maintenance
- Standardization of software practices
- Preservation of know-how
Component quality: the inevitable issue

- The key issue
  - Bad-quality components are major risk
  - Deficiencies scale up, too

- High-quality components could transform the state of the software industry (if it wanted to — currently doesn’t)
Where to focus effort?

Applications

Specialized components

Basic components

Compilers, operating systems
Perfectionism

- Component design should be Formula-1 racing of software “engineering”.

- In component development, perfectionism is good.
What exactly is a component?

Working definition:

Program element such that:

- It may be used by other program elements (not just humans, or non-software systems). These elements will be called “clients”

- Its authors need not know about the clients.

- Clients’ authors need only know what the component’s author tells them.
Classifying components by...

Lifecycle role:
- Analysis
- Design
- Implementation

Flexibility:
- Static
- Dynamic
- Replaceable

Abstraction level:
- Functional (subroutine)
- Casual (package)
- Data (class)
- Cluster (framework)
- System (binary comp.)

Form of use:
- Interface only
- Source only
- Source + hiding

Economics:
- Free
- Purchased
- Rented
This is a broad view of components

- Encompasses patterns and frameworks
- Software, especially with object technology, permits “pluggable” components (“don’t call us, we’ll call you), where client programmers can insert their own mechanisms.
- Supports component families
Patterns are both one of the greatest advances in software engineering, and a step backwards from the push for reuse through object technology.

We should try to turn successful patterns into components!

Language mechanisms (e.g. multiple inheritance, constrained genericity, agents etc. in Eiffel) make this possible in many cases.

∀ x | x considered harmful

Systematic effort in progress (with Karine Arnout) on Gamma et al. book patterns. See paper on event library on web site.
Our experience: Eiffelbase

- Collection classes ("Knuthware")
- Consistency principle
- Strict design principles: command-query separation, operand-option separation, taxonomy, uniform access...
- Strict interface and style rules
Eiffelbase hierarchy
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How to get there

- **Low road:**
  - Component Certification

- **High road:**
  - Proofs of correctness
The Low Road: Component Quality Model

A: Acceptance

B: Behavior

C: Constraints

D: Design

E: Extension
Component Quality Model

A: Acceptance
   A.1 Some reuse attested
   A.2 Producer reputation
   A.3 Published evaluations

B: Behavior

C: Constraints

D: Design

E: Extension
## Component Quality Model

- **A: Acceptance**
- **B: Behavior**
- **C: Constraints**
- **D: Design**
- **E: Extension**

### B.1 Examples
### B.2 Usage documentation
### B.3 Preconditioned
### B.4 Some postconditions
### B.5 Full postconditions
### B.6 Observable invariants
Contract levels

1. Type

2. Functional specification

3. Performance specification

4. Quality of Service

(Source: Jézéquel, Mingins et al.)
## Component Quality Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: Acceptance</th>
<th>B: Behavior</th>
<th>C: Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.1 Platform spec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.2 Ease of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.3 Response time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.4 Memory occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.5 Bandwidth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.6 Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.7 Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C: Constraints
- C.1 Platform spec
- C.2 Ease of use
- C.3 Response time
- C.4 Memory occupation
- C.5 Bandwidth
- C.6 Availability
- C.7 Security

### E: Extension

---

*Chair of Software Engineering*
Component Quality Model

A: Acceptance

B: Behavior

C: Constraints

D: Design

E: Extension

D.1 Precise dependency doc
D.2 Consistent API rules
D.3 Strict design rules
D.4 Extensive test cases
D.5 Some proved properties
D.6 Proofs of preconditions, postconditions & invariants
Component Quality Model

A: Acceptance

B: Behavior

C: Constraints

D: Design

E: Extension

E.1  Portable across platforms
E.2  Mechanisms for addition
E.3  Mechanisms for redefinition
E.4  User action pluggability
A Component Certification Center

- Principles
- Methods and processes
- Standards
- Services for component providers and component consumers
The high road: towards proofs?

A: Acceptance

B: Behavior

C: Constraints

D: Design

E: Extension

D.1 Precise dependency doc
D.2 Consistent API rules
D.3 Strict design rules
D.4 Extensive test cases
D.5 Some proved properties
D.6 Proofs of preconditions, postconditions & invariants
Proof technology and formal methods

- Constant advances in recent years
- PVS, Isabelle, Coq, ...
- B (method and tool)
- Most applications: life-critical systems in transportation, defense etc. Example: security system of Paris Metro METEOR line
Formal methods and reuse

- Components should be good

- Proofs should be economical!
Proofs and O-O: Impedance mismatch

- Refine

or

- Prove?
Dangers of “proven components”

- You might be believed!
- One doesn’t prove a component
  You may at best be able to prove specific properties of the component
- Do not raise undue expectations
“Proving classes”

EiffelBase libraries (fundamental data structures and algorithms):

- Classes are equipped with contracts

- “Proving a class” means proving that the implementation satisfies the contracts
Top of the Eiffelbase hierarchy
Proof strategy for classes

DEFERRED CLASS

Transform

Devise model

Inherits from

EFFECTIVE CLASS

Transform

MATH VERSION

Prove consistency

ABSTRACT MODEL

Prove consistency

MATH VERSION
Proof strategy for classes

- The tough part is the object structure, especially pointers

- Object Calculus (based on partial functions and ideas from both axiomatic and denotational semantics)

- Then add classes, inheritance, dynamic binding...
“Most of the improvement in the reliability of computer systems has come from improvement in the basic components”

“You’ll see ever increasing portions of the effort devoted to design and verification”
Underlying work

- Semantic theory for full O-O language
- Language development (Eiffel 5)
- Contract extraction
  Cf. Karine Arnout, Bertrand Meyer, "Outing Closet Contracts from .NET libraries"
- From patterns to components
- Modeling efforts
“Inverted Curriculum” for introductory programming:

- Use libraries from the start
- Exciting application domain
- Give students heaps of code
- From consumers to producer (outside-in)
- Abstraction: teach, don’t preach

There will be a textbook and supporting material
Some of the challenges ahead

General:
- Convince the software engineering community
- Convince industry (producers, consumers)
- Define ambitious, feasible objectives
- Achieve balance between high and low road

“High road”:
- Finish up the theory
- Produce mechanized proofs

“Low road”:
- Define standard terminology
- Get the economics right
Applied research in universities?

- In some areas, one cannot compete with industry.
- Applied, tool-oriented work is necessary and possible.
- Components are an ideal example.
The biggest hope and challenge for the software industry is at the confluence of quality engineering (especially formal methods) and reuse.

“Trusted Components”

Now is the time to do it.
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