

IRISA

## Software Factories : Software Product Lines with Model Driven Engineering

**Prof. Jean-Marc Jézéquel**

IRISA

Campus de Beaulieu

F-35042 Rennes Cedex

Tel : +33 299 847 192 Fax : +33 299 847 171

e-mail : jezequel@irisa.fr


<http://www.irisa.fr/prive/jezequel>



## Software Intensive Systems



- Importance of non-functional properties
  - distributed reactive systems, parallel & asynchronous
  - quality of service : security, reliability, latency, performance...
- Variations in functional aspects
  - notion of *product lines* (space, time)



## Software Reuse

- drastically decrease cost of software development and maintenance
- increase quality of software
- reuse of existing software is one of the most promising approaches
- construct applications by composing reusable software pieces

(cost ⇒ TTM ⇒ staff)

3

## Two approaches to reuse

- Opportunistic:
  - the software engineer reuses pieces of software that fit the current problem and adds them to the software.
- Planned:
  - the organization puts explicit effort in developing reusable artifacts that provide the 'right' abstractions, 'right' level of variability and that fit into an higher level structure.
- Opportunistic reuse does not work in practice
  - As in automotive and other industries, build on the notion of **Product Line**


4

# Software Product Lines

- A software product line consists of:
  - product line architecture
  - set of reusable components
  - set of products, where each product has
    - » product architecture derived from PLA
    - » instantiated and configured components
    - » product-specific code



# Software Product Lines



## Many Issues Around SPLs

- Assets [Jacobsen]:


- architecture
- components
- systems

- Views [SEI]:

- business
- organization
- process
- technology

- Lifecycle [Bosch]:

- development
- usage
- evolution



11

# Technical Issues in SPLs: Managing variability

12

## Initiating a Product Line

	Evolutionary	Revolutionary
Existing product line	Develop vision for PLA Develop one comp. at a time by evolving existing components	Develop PLA, components and products based on requirement super set
New product line	PLA and components evolve based on requirements posed by new PL members	PLA and components developed to match requirements of all PL members

13

## Evolving Existing Products

- **advantages**
  - reduced risk due to
    - » small up front investment
    - » early return on first shared components
  - relatively small effect on production schedule
- **disadvantages**
  - larger total investment

14

## Replace Existing Products

- advantages
    - shorter conversion time
    - smaller total investment
  - disadvantages
    - higher risk
    - negative effect on production schedule
- role of hardware and mechanical parts

15

## Applicability of SPL concepts

- context: consultancy company or IT department performing projects with partially overlapping requirements
- define common architecture and common components/subsystems
- develop (slightly) more general components in normal projects
- increase the variability and generality of the component in subsequent projects
- **balance investment and risk!**

16

## **SPL Overview**

- **development**
  - design product line architecture
  - develop software components
- **deployment**
  - develop members of product line
  - Ideally, "just" configure and specialize the product line
- **evolution**
  - evolve all assets in the product line
  - Software configuration management

17

## **Model Driven Engineering for SPL**

- **How to model PL with the UML?**
  - Variability in the UML class diagrams
- **Constraints on PL models**
  - The use of OCL (Object Constraints Language ) to specify PL constraints
- **The PL derivation**
  - The decision model
  - The PL derivation as the UML models transformation

18

## **The 3 Dimensions of Software Configuration Management:**

[Estublier et al. 95]

- The Variant dimension
  - Handle environmental differences
- The Revision dimension
  - Evolution over time
- The Concurrent Activities dimension
  - Many developers are authorized to modify the same configuration item
- Even with the help of sophisticated tools, the complexity might be daunting
  - Try to simplify it by reifying the variants of an OO system

## **Variants in Software Systems**

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| ■ Hardware Level                           | ■ $V_i = 16$ |
| ■ Heterogeneous Distributed Systems        | ■ $V_p = 4$  |
| ■ Peculiarities in Target Operating System |              |
| ■ Compiler Differences                     |              |
| ■ Range of Products                        | ■ $V_n = 8$  |
| ■ User Preferences for GUI                 | ■ $V_g = 5$  |
| ■ Internationalization                     | ■ $V_l = 24$ |
- 
- Number of Variants =  $V_p * V_n * V_g * 2^{V_i + V_l - 2}$ 
    - That's 43,980,465,111,040 possible variants

## Traditional Approaches

- Patch the executable
- Device Drivers
  - source level, link time, boot time, on demand at runtime
- Static Configuration Table
- Conditional Compilation / Runtime Tests

```


If (language == french) {
  #ifdef MSW
    io_puts(0,"Bonjour",7);
  #elseif TEXT
    printf("Bonjour\n");
  #endif
} else {
  #ifdef MSW
    io_puts(0,"Hello",5);
  #elseif TEXT
    printf("Hello\n");
  #endif
}

```

- Static and Dynamic configuration information intermingled
- Hard to change your mind on what should be static or dynamic...

## Basic Idea


- Abstract the Intent
  - io.write\_line(language.hello)
- Rely on Dynamic Binding for the Details
  - Don't care now for static/dynamic distinction




- Uncouple the variations from the selection process
  - Automatically derive a product using OCL 2 meta-model transformation

## The Mercure PL as example

- A family of SMDS<sub>[Jezequel 96]</sub> (Switched Multi-Megabits Data Service) servers.
- Delivering, forwarding, and relaying messages from and to a set of network interfaces.



23



24

# Variability in UML class diagrams

## Abstraction

Inheritance, Abstract Factory

- Parameterization


UML class templates

- Optionality

UML extensions mechanisms (Stereotype « Optional »)

- Alternatives

Optional + Constraint




## Product Line Constraints

- Generic Constraints (GC): Constraints for ALL product line architectures (architecture coherence)
- Specific Constraints (SC): Constraints for a SPECIFIC product line architecture (relationships between specific elements).


28

## GC as OCL meta-level constraints



29

# Examples



## Dependency constraint


context **Dependency**

```

inv : self.supplier → exists(S:ModelElement S.isStereotyped('optional'))
      implies self.client → forall( C:ModelElement |
      C.isStereotyped('optional') )
  
```

30

## SC as OCL meta-level constraints



31

# Examples

## ■ Presence constraint

context **Model\_Management::Model**

inv:

**self.presenceClass('ENGINE1')** implies  
**self.presenceClass('NETDRIVER1')**

## ■ Mutual exclusion constraint

context **Model\_Management::Model**

inv:

**(self.presenceClass('GUI1')** implies not  
**(self.presenceClass('LANGUAGE\_CAT2'))** and  
**(self.presenceClass('LANGUAGE\_CAT2')** implies not  
**self.presenceClass('GUI1'))**

32

# Product Line Derivation


Products \ VPs	GUI	Language	Manager	NetDriver	Engine
CustomMercure	GUI1, GUI2	Language 2-1	Manager1	NetDriver1	Engine1
MiniMercure	GUI1	Language 1	Manager1	NetDriver1	Engine1
FullMercure	all	all	all	all	all

GUI 1 *mutual-exclusion* Lang  
Cat 2

33


# The decision model

- The Abstract Factory Design Pattern
  - [Gamma et al 95]



34

# Dynamic Configuration



35

## The PL derivation

- Manipulate the UML meta-model to automatically derive a product model using a Model Transformation Language (MTL)

### DeriveProductLine

**Input:** PL\_model: Model  
aConcreteFactory: Class  
pre : -- check Generic Constraints on PL\_model  
**Output:** Product\_model: Model  
post :-- check Specific Constraints on the PL\_model

36

## Model Transformation

- By limiting the range of variants available from a given Concrete Factory:
  - The transformer may know the set of *living* classes
    - » special case of Partial Evaluation
  - Generate a specialized model for the product
    - » When only one *living* class for an abstract varying part:
      - Dynamic binding replaced with direct call (and even inlining)
    - » When only a few *living* classes
      - Dynamic binding replaced by *if then ... else*
      - Implemented in e.g., GNU SmallEiffel
- All static configuration issues kept encapsulated and do not pollute the model



## The PL derivation



- The Variants selection:
  - Using operation factory stereotypes
- The Model specialization:
  - Removes all optional classes which have not been selected
- The Model optimization:
  - Deletes unused factories, Optimize inheritance


38

```
DerivePL (PL_model: Model, aConcreteFactory: Class) : Model {  
  
    selectedVariants: Set;  
    Result := clone(PL_model);  
    selectedVariants := getSelectedVariants(aConcreteFactory);  
    // Model specialization  
    for each optional class C in PL_model do  
        if (the class name of C not in selectedVariants)  
            and names of all subclasses of C not in selectedVariants)  
        then  
            delete the class C from Result;  
        endif  
    done  
    // Model optimization  
    replace abstract classes with only one subclass S by S  
    delete all other factories  
}
```


39










44



45




## Derivation of products from product-lines: behavioral issues based on Sequence Diagrams



## HMSCs & UML2.0 SDs: Combined SDs

- A combined SD: refers to a set of interactions and composes them by means of operators:
  - **Sequence (seq):** weak sequential composition.
  - **Alternative (alt):** choice between interaction operands.
  - **Loop (loop):** iteration of an interaction.
- Extended with operators to model variability
  - **Optional, variation, virtual...**



50

## STEP 1: Behavioral derivation

Product	Decision model instance (DMI)
BS1	DM1 = {(settingLimit, TRUE), (settingCurrency, FALSE), (withdrawAccount, 1), (fromEuro, FALSE), (toEuro, FALSE)}
BS2	DM2 = {(settingLimit, FALSE), (settingCurrency, FALSE), (withdrawAccount, 2), (fromEuro, FALSE), (toEuro, FALSE)}
BS3	DM3 = {(settingLimit, FALSE), (settingCurrency, FALSE), (withdrawAccount, 2), (fromEuro, TRUE), (toEuro, TRUE)}
BS4	DM4 = {(settingLimit, TRUE), (settingCurrency, TRUE), (withdrawAccount, 1), (fromEuro, TRUE), (toEuro, TRUE)}

$$RESD = [[PL-RESD]]_{DMi}$$

51

## Behavioral derivation rules

$$\bullet \text{ [[optional name [ E ] ]}_{DMi} = \begin{cases} E \text{ IF } (name, TRUE) \in DMi \\ E_{\emptyset} \text{ IF } (name, FALSE) \in DMi \end{cases}$$

$E_{\emptyset}$  is the *empty* SD: neutral element for **seq**, **alt** ; idempotent for **loop**

$$\bullet \text{ [[variation name [ E1, E2,.. ] ]}_{DMi} = \quad E_i \text{ IF } (name, i) \in DMi$$

$$\bullet \text{ [[virtual name [ E ] ]}_{DMi} = E_{\text{reff}} \text{ IF } (name, E_{\text{reff}}) \in DMi, E \text{ ELSE}$$

52

**DM2 =** ((settingLimit, FALSE), (settingCurrency, FALSE), (withdrawAccount, 2), (fromEuro, FALSE), (toEuro, FALSE))

$E_{BS2} = \text{[[ } E_{BPL} \text{ ] ]}_{DM2}$

$$E_{BS2} = \text{loop (Deposit alt (CreateAccount seq (CreateAccountOk seq } E_{\emptyset} \text{ seq } E_{\emptyset} \text{)) alt CreateAccountFailed) alt (WithdrawWithoutLimit seq (WithdrawOk alt WithdrawFailed)) alt ( } E_{\emptyset} \text{ ) alt ( } E_{\emptyset} \text{ ) )}$$

$E_{\emptyset}$  is the *empty* SD: neutral element for **seq**, **alt** ; idempotent for **loop**  
 → expression reduction

53

**DM2** = {(settingLimit, FALSE), (settingCurrency, FALSE), (withdrawAccount, 2), (fromEuro, FALSE), (toEuro, FALSE)}


$E_{BS2} = [[ E_{BPL} ]]$  DM2

$E_{BS2} = \text{loop (Deposit alt (CreateAccount seq (CreateAccountOk )) alt CreateAccountFailed) alt (WithdrawWithoutLimit seq (WithdrawOk alt WithdrawFailed))}$

Step 1 result : One expression (RESO) for each product


54

## STEP2: UML Sequence Diagrams (SDs): → Statecharts



**Inter-object view: Many objects, one example.**

Synthesis




**Intra-object view: Single object, a complete behavior.**

### ■ Related work:

- *Kriss et al* [UML 98],
- *Koskimies et al* [IEEE Software 98]
- *Whittle et al* [ICSE 00] ,
- *Mäkinen et al* [ICSE 01]..etc

55


## From combined SDs



56

## Statecharts operators


### ■ 1) Sequence (seq<sub>s</sub>)



57

## Statecharts operators(contd.)


### – 2) Alternative ( $\text{alt}_s$ )



58

## Statecharts operators(contd.)

### – 3) Iteration ( $\text{loop}_s$ )



59

## From combined SDs (contd.)

```

E = loop (UserArrives seq ( loop (EnterPassword seq
BadPassword) seq EnterPassword seq (BadAccount
alt UserCancel) alt UserCancel))
    
```




```

E = loops (P(UserArrives, ATM) seqs ( loops
(P(EnterPassword,ATM) seqs P(BadPassword, ATM))
seqs P(EnterPassword,ATM) seqs (P(BadAccount,ATM)
alts P(UserCancel,ATM)) alts P(UserCancel,ATM)))
    
```


60

## Result: Bank StateChart for BS2



61

## Result: Bank StateChart for BS4



62

# Conclusion & Perspectives

63

## Conclusion

- Handling variability in SPL is complex
  - Exponential number of configurations
- Use models (& aspects) to manage complexity
  - Abstract away from #IFDEF & diff
- Executable Meta-Modeling to Automate Product Derivation from SPL Models
  - Both from Static & Dynamic aspects

64

## Perspectives on SPL Research

- Composition of models
  - New ways of composing software from modeling elements
    - » at both model and meta-model levels
    - » Unifying MDE, AOSD, SPL, Generative Programming...
  - Composing models at runtime: dynamic adaptation
    - » FP7 STREP: DiVA (03/2008-03-2011)

65