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From Real Time to Real World

Real-time software has traditionally been perceived as a niche discipline, but...
An increasing number of software applications interact directly with the physical world
Application Types in This Category

- Control and monitoring systems, communications systems, industrial control systems, automotive systems, etc.
- Financial systems (banking, point of sale terminals, etc.)
- Computer-aided design tools (AutoCAD, CATIA, etc.)
- Simulation software (physics, weather, machinery, etc.)
- Computer games software
- etc.

All of these application types either interact directly with the physical world and/or incorporate a representation of it.

Q: Are our software technologies up to the task?
"The 'root cause' of the loss of the spacecraft was the failed translation of English units into metric units in a segment of ground-based, navigation-related mission software..."

-- NASA report, 1999

Q: Why was this not detected by the compiler as a type mismatch?

No mainstream programming language has a first-class concept of a "physical" value or time

```java
force:Force = 225;
delay(100);
```
Q: Can’t we just define a special “physical” type?

```plaintext
enum LengthUnit {mm, cm, m, km};

type Length {
    real value,
    LengthUnit unit};
```

No: a compiler would still not catch unit mismatches or know how to compare two or more values of such a type

In contrast, a **first-class language construct** has semantics defined by the language that are known and supported by all conforming tools (compilers, validators, interpreters, debuggers, etc.)
The Case of the Vista™ OS

Q: Which of these Computing platforms can support Vista™?

A: None of them

- (a) MITS Altair 8800 (8080 CPU) 4KB
- (b) Sinclair ZX81 (Z80 CPU) 8KB
- (c) Lenovo ThinkPad X61 (Intel® Core™2 Duo CPU) 1GB

Clearly, not much thought was given to the capabilities of the underlying hardware platform.
Our current software technologies and design methods are not very well suited for tackling interactive applications

(A problem of accidental complexity)

To understand why things are the way they are, we need to know how they came to be...
A Brief Look Back

Original computer applications were devised to mechanize computation of complex algorithms

- Ballistics tables, code breaking, etc.
- ...which is why they are called “computers”

⇒ Strong focus on numerical methods, mathematical logic, and symbol manipulation

A clear algorithmic bias
The Response: Software Platonism

- “I see no meaningful difference between programming methodology and mathematical methodology.”
  -- Edsger W. Dijkstra (EWD 1209)

- “Because [programs] are put together in the context of a set of information requirements, they observe no natural limits other than those imposed by those requirements. Unlike the world of engineering, there are no immutable laws to violate.”
  -- Wei-Lung Wang, Comm. of the ACM (45, 5), 2002

This was and still is a highly influential view.
Current Mainstream Programming Languages

“Languages of the future for programming techniques of the past” [E. Dijkstra (re: APL)]

http://www.pasteur.fr/formation/infobio/python/ch01s03.html

Source: Tiobe & Jobs
The Platonist Approach to Software Design

- Focus on system functionality ("business logic") first and foremost
  - No point in worrying about other concerns (e.g., performance, availability) if that is incorrect

- Donald Knuth:
  "Premature optimization is the root of all evil"

- "Platform independence"

Unstated assumption:
Other concerns are separable from functionality and, hence, can be retrofitted without disrupting the business logic (?)
Those “Other” Concerns

- The “ilities” of software
  - Reliability, scalability, availability, testability, performance/throughput, security, maintainability, stability, controllability, observability, extensibility, interoperability, usability, etc.

Most of these are affected either directly or indirectly by the physical aspects of the system (e.g., platform, communication networks)
Did someone just say “NON-FUNCTIONAL”!?
So, What’s Wrong with Saying “Non-functional”?

1. **Negative** identification (does not tell us what they are)
2. Suggests **second-order** concerns (auxiliary, miscellaneous, etc.)
3. Bundles in an arbitrary way a collection of very **diverse** but **often critical** characteristics
   - Although each of them is achieved by different idiosyncratic means
4. **Most critical**: **separates** them from **associated functionality**
   - Many have a fundamental impact on how the functionality is realized
   - NB: They are mostly non-modular and **pervasive** ⇒ **quality** cannot be retrofitted easily (e.g., no such thing as a reliability or scalability **module** or **aspect**)

- Is “cross-cutting” a better term?
  - Not much: only deals with points 1 and 2 above
  - False impression that the problem can be solved with aspect-oriented solutions
The Wisdom of the Ancients*

* “The ancients stole all our good new ideas” [M. Twain/ R.W. Emerson?] 

“All machinery is derived from nature, and is founded on the teaching and instruction of the revolution of the firmament.”

-- Vitruvius, On Architecture, Book X, 1st Century BC

Software + Computer (Hardware) = Special-purpose machine

--Nancy Leveson, Safeware, 1995

Q: What impact do the physical characteristics of this have on…

...this
Software Physics – and how to cope with it
What Makes Things Difficult for Software

The essential complexities of the physical world:

- Physical distribution
- Modal behaviour
- Non-determinism (asynchrony)
- Concurrency
- Qualitative diversity
- Quantity can affect quality

The physical world is complex and some of this complexity is necessarily transferred to the software.
The Effects of Physical Distribution (1)

- Structural impact:
  - Need to specify complex topological structures
  - Need for local software "agents" that represent and interact with that world to the rest of the software
Coping with Structural Impacts of Distribution

- Introduction of the OO paradigm has proved fundamental here
  - A structural approach: programs represented by networks of collaborating machines
  - Introduction of logical entities (e.g., a “call” object)
- Enhanced by the introduction of architectural description languages (ADLs)
  - E.g., UML structured classifiers, collaborations, AADL
It is not possible to guarantee that agreement can be reached in finite time over an asynchronous communication medium, if the medium is lossy or one of the distributed sites can fail.

The Effects of Physical Distribution (2)

- Behavioral impact:
  - Communication delays (outdated status data) and failures (e.g., loss, duplication, reordering of messages)
  - Partial system (i.e., node) failures

- Coping mechanisms:
  - Fault-tolerance strategies (e.g., protective redundancies, fault diagnosis, fault recovery) have been defined
  - Need an ontological framework of failures and corresponding remedies
  - *First-class language support needed for these types of mechanisms*
    - *Research challenge*: can and how should a computer (modeling) language support these?
Modal Behaviour

- Response to an event depends on what happened before (history)
- *Coping mechanism: state machines*
  - In particular hierarchical state machines for specifying modal behaviors (e.g., UML state machines)
Non-Determinism (Asynchrony)

- Events can and do occur out of desired or expected order
  - Yet, need to be handled appropriately
- **Coping mechanisms:**
  - State machines
  - **Research challenge:** modeling uncertainty and defining corresponding language support

Ringing phone

Python swallowing a cow
Concurrency

- Difficult to reason about concurrency
Coping with Concurrency

- Direct language support for existing concurrency management and synchronization mechanisms
  - Active objects (e.g., UML): programs as networks of concurrent entities
  - Synchronization mechanisms (run-to-completion, priority scheduling mechanisms, mutual exclusion mechanisms, etc.)
- The MARTE profile as an example
Beyond Logic: MARTE

coping with quality and quantity in software
Where Software Meets Physics

- Everything that the software senses and performs is mediated by the platform and is influenced by its physical properties
Platforms: The Raw Material of Software

Software Application [SW]

OS, Runtime Framework(s), VMs, etc. [SW]

Computing hardware [HW]

- **Software Platform**: The full complement of software and hardware required for a given application program to execute correctly

Mainstream programming and modeling languages lack support for representing platforms and their characteristics!
What About Platform Independence?

- An important and useful notion
  - Helps abstract away irrelevant technological detail
  - Necessary for software portability

- **Platform independence does not mean platform ignorance**
  - There are ways of achieving platform independence that account for the influence of platform characteristics

Any claims of “platform independence” should be accompanied by clear statements of the range of platforms that the application is independent of.
What We Need to Know About Platforms

1. Its relevant quality of service characteristics (size, capacity, performance, bandwidth, etc.)
2. Its computing and communications structure
3. The deployment of application software components across the platform
What is MARTE?

- A **domain-specific modeling language** (DSML) for the design and analysis of modern cyber-physical systems
  - **Modeling and Analysis of Real-Time and Embedded systems**
  - Supplements UML (i.e., does not replace it)
  - Realized as a UML profile
What MARTE Adds to UML

1. SUPPORT FOR **CONCISE AND SEMANTICALLY MEANINGFUL MODELING OF CPS SYSTEMS**:
   - A domain-specific modeling language for modeling real-time, embedded, and cyber-physical systems
   - Support for precise specifications of quality of service (QoS) characteristics (e.g., delays, memory capacities, CPU speeds, energy consumption)
   - Can be used directly in conjunction with SysML for greater CPS support

2. SUPPORT FOR **FORMAL ENGINEERING ANALYSES OF MODELS OF RTE/CPS**:
   - A generic framework for certain types of (automatable) quantitative analyses of UML models
   - Suited to computer-based automation
Example: “Bare” UML Model

- Ticker
  - OS timer utility
  - sd

- ClockApp
  - «signal» tick()
  - How many?
  - Execution time?
  - :Ticker
  - :ClockApp
  - Scheduling delay?
  - display(v)

- Display
  - display(v: string)
  - :Display

- Hardware

- Loop
  - HW interrupt (frequency?)
  - tick()
  - @t1

- Constraints
  - {(@t2 - @t1) <= 100}
  - Which units?
Annotating a UML Model with MARTE

ClockApp

- «timerResource»
  - {isPeriodic=true, duration=(100, us)}

- «swSchedulableResource»
  - {isStaticSchedulingFeature=true, isPreemptable=false}

- «resourceUsage»
  - {execTime = ((47*CPUrating), us)}

Display

- «hwDevice»
  - {description="DSP1455A"}

- «resourceUsage»
  - {execTime = (1.5, us)}

Ticker

- «signal» tick()

NB: variable
Core Concept: Resource

  “A source of supply of money, materials, staff and other assets that can be drawn upon... in order to function effectively”

- In MARTE, a platform is viewed as a collection of different types of resources, which can be drawn upon by applications
  
  - The finite nature of resources reflects the physical nature of the underlying hardware platform(s)

![Diagram showing the relationship between Platform, Resource, Computing Resource, and Memory Resource.](attachment://diagram.png)
Core Concept: Resource Services

- In MARTE resources are viewed as **service providers**
  - Consequently, applications are viewed as **service clients**

- Resource services are characterized by their
  - Functionality
  - Quality of service (QoS)

  ![Diagram](image.png)
  - e.g. (platform services):
    - memory provisioning
    - processing power
    - bandwidth
    - energy
    - mutual exclusion
Core Concept: Quality of Service (QoS)

- **Quality of Service (QoS):**
  - A measure of the effectiveness of service provisioning
- **Two complementary perspectives on QoS**
  - **Required QoS:** the demand side (what applications require)
  - **Offered QoS:** the supply side (what platforms provide)

Many engineering analyses consist of calculating whether (QoS) supply can meet (QoS) demand

“Virtually every calculation an engineer performs...is a failure calculation...to provide the limits than cannot be exceeded”

-- Henry Petroski
QoS Compatibility

- We have powerful mechanisms for verifying functional compatibility (e.g., type theory) but relatively little support for verifying QoS compatibility.

Key engineering question: \((\text{RequiredQoS} \leq \text{OfferedQoS})\)?
Why It is Difficult to Predict Software Properties

- Because platform resources are often shared
  - ...often by independently designed applications
  - Contention for resources

![Diagram showing resource contention and QoS requirements](image_url)
Quantitative QoS Values

- Expressed as an *amount of some physical measure*
- Need a means for specifying physical quantities
  - **Value**: quantity
  - **Dimension**: kind of quantity (e.g., time, length, speed)
  - **Unit**: measurement unit (e.g., second, meter, km/h)

- However, additional optional qualifiers can also be attached to these values:
  - **source**: estimated/calculated/required/measured
  - **precision
  - **direction**: increasing/decreasing (for QoS comparison)
  - **statQ**: maximum/minimum/mean/percentile/distribution
MARTE Library: Predefined Types

- **SourceKind**
  - **est**
  - **meas**
  - **calc**
  - **req**

- **DirectionKind**
  - **incr**
  - **decr**

**NFP_CommonType**

- **expr**: VSL_Expression
- **source**: SourceKind
- **statQ**: StatisticalQualifierKind
- **dir**: DirectionKind

**NFP_Boolean**
- value: Boolean

**NFP_String**
- value: String

**NFP_Real**
- value: Real

**NFP_Boolean**

- **NFP_DateTime**
  - value: DateTime

**NFP_Duration**
- unit: TimeUnitKind
- clock: String
- precision: Real

**NFP_DataTrRate**
- unit: DataTrRateUnitKind
- precision: Real

**NFP_Frequency**
- unit: FrequencyUnitKind
- precision: Real

**NFP_Power**
- unit: PowerUnitKind
- precision: Real

**NFP_Energy**
- unit: EnergyUnitKind
- precision: Real

**NFP_Length**
- unit: LengthUnitKind
- precision: Real

**NFP_Weight**
- unit: WeightUnitKind
- precision: Real

**NFP_Area**
- unit: AreaUnitKind
- precision: Real
Explicit Approach: Topics Covered

Structure of Time
- time bases
- multiple time bases
- instants
- time relationships

Access to Time
- clocks
- logical clocks
- chronometric clocks
- current time

Using Time
- timed elements
- timed events
- timed actions
- timed constraints
Example: Time Annotations

Sd DataAcquisition

:Controller

start() { jitter(t0)<(5, us) }

acquire() { d1<=(1, ms) }

@t0

@t1

Constraint in an observation with condition expression

Constraint1 = { (t0[i+1] - t0[i]) > (100, ms) }
Constraint2 = { (t3 when data<5.0) < t2+(30, ms) }

:Sensor

@t2

@d1

{ [d1..30*d1] }

@t3

sendData (data) { [(0, ms)..(10, ms)] }

Duration expression between two successive occurrences

Extended duration intervals with bound « [ ] » specification

Instant Interval Constraint

Jitter constraint
MARTE Support for Computer-Aided Analysis
Generic Quantitative Analysis Model (GQAM)

- Captures the pattern common to many different kinds of quantitative analyses (using concepts from GRM)
  - Specialized for each specific analysis kind

```
Demand Side

Work demand arrivals (Workload intensity)
(e.g., event arrivals, time triggers)

Work Characterization (Scenarios)
(e.g., application programs, system programs, etc.)

Analysis Context
```

```
Supply Side

Resource1
(e.g., disk)

. .

ResourceN
(e.g., CPU)
```
Performance Analysis Example – Context

*An interaction (seq. diagram representation)*

\[<<\text{GaPerformanceContext}\>> \{\text{contextParams} = \text{in$Nusers, in$ThinkTime, in$Images, in$R}\}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{browser} & : \text{getHomePage} \\
\text{webserver} & : \text{getCustomerData} \\
\text{database} & : \text{opt} \quad \text{[if customer is logged in]} \text{getCustomerData}
\end{align*}

\[<<\text{GaWorkload Event}\>> \{\text{closed (population=\text{Nusers}, extDelay=ThinkTime)}\}\]

\[<<\text{PaStep}\>> \{\text{hostDemand} = (1,ms), \text{respT} = \{(1,s,\text{percent95}), \text{req}\}, \{(R,s,\text{percent95}), \text{calc}\}\}\]

\[<<\text{PaCommStep}\>> \{\text{msgSize} = (2.9, \text{KB})\}\]

\[<<\text{PaStep}\>> \{\text{hostDemand} = (2, ms)\}\]

Slide courtesy of D. Petriu, M. Woodside (Carleton U.)
Typical Performance Analysis Results

1. Utilization
   - Saturation

2. Residence Time
   - Saturation

3. Queue length
   - Saturation

Slide courtesy of D. Petriu, M. Woodside (Carleton U.)
Summary

- Software is increasingly more integrated into everyday operations, which involves an ongoing interaction with the physical world.
- Our mainstream programming languages are not well suited for this environment.
- Needed: Higher-order languages that are more directly connected to this environment:
  - Model-based technologies and practices
  - Higher levels of abstraction and automation
- Still a research topic, but we already have a number of important components of the solution.
- THANK YOU-

QUESTIONS,
COMMENTS,
ARGUMENTS...
Supplementary Slides
Accidental Complexity or Why It's Called “Code”*

Can you see what this program is doing?

Code: a system used for brevity or secrecy [Dictionary.com]
The Corresponding UML Model

Can you see it now?
```cpp
SC_MODULE(producer) {
    sc_outmaster<int> out1;
    sc_in<bool> start; // kick-start
    void generate_data ()
    {
        for(int i =0; i <10; i++) {
            out1 =i; //to invoke slave;
        }
        SC_CTOR(producer)
        {
            SC_METHOD(generate_data);
            sensitive << start;}});
    SC_MODULE(consumer)
    {
        sc_inslave<int> in1;
        int sum; // state variable
        void accumulate (){ sum += in1;
        cout << “Sum = “ << sum << endl;}
    SC_MODULE(top) // container
    {
        producer *A1;
        consumer *B1;
        sc_link_mp<int> link1;
        SC_CTOR(top)
        {
            A1 = new producer(“A1”);
            A1.out1(link1);
            B1 = new consumer(“B1”);
            B1.in1(link1);}};
```
Model-Based Engineering: The Essential Coping Approach

- An approach to system and software development in which computer-based software models play an indispensable role
- Based on two time-proven premises:

![Diagram](image)

1. **ABSTRACTION**
   - Realm of modeling languages
   - switch (state) {
     - case '1': action1;
     - newState('2');
     - break;
     - case '2': action2;
     - newState('3');
     - break;
     - case '3': action3;
     - newState('1');
     - break;
   }

2. **AUTOMATION**
   - Realm of tools and model transforms
   - switch (state) {
     - case '1': action1;
     - newState('2');
     - break;
     - case '2': action2;
     - newState('3');
     - break;
     - case '3': action3;
     - newState('1');
     - break;
   }
A shameless plug

Available from a web page/bookstore near you:

Publisher: Morgan Kaufmann
ISBN: 978-0-12-416619-6
The “Software Crisis”

- Systems of this type were designed primarily by classical engineers (mechanical, electrical, radio, etc.) and physicists
  - Software was viewed as a simple production problem (i.e., writing the code) – as opposed to a research problem
  - *It is still a common attitude today among many traditional engineering professionals*
    - A “soft” science: difficult to make irrefutable assertions or predictions
- But, the software problems of SAGE and similar systems exposed the difficulties of designing reliable software
  - 1968 NATO Conference on Software Engineering ⇒ “software crisis”
Functionality vs. Engineering

Functionality (Logic) … and its Engineering Manifestation

- Air conditioning
- Plumbing
- Electrical wiring
- Water recycling
- Waste management
- Steering
- etc.

But, does this paradigm apply to software?