Software Design and Evolution

1. Introduction

Oscar Nierstrasz
Students’ To-Do List for every Semester

> JMCS students

- Register for **teaching units** by **October 10, 2014**
  - [http://mcs.unibnf.ch/admin](http://mcs.unibnf.ch/admin)
- Register for **exams** by **December 11, 2014** *
  - [http://mcs.unibnf.ch/admin](http://mcs.unibnf.ch/admin)
- Request reimbursement of **travel expenses** by **January 31, 2015**
  - [http://www.unifr.ch/benefri](http://www.unifr.ch/benefri)

> Hosted JMCS students (e.g. CS bachelor students etc.)

- The same, and additionally:
- Request for **Academia access** by **September 30, 2014**
  - [http://mcs.unibnf.ch/node/535](http://mcs.unibnf.ch/node/535)

* For SDE only; for other MSc courses, by Jan 9, 2015
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lecturers</strong></th>
<th>Oscar Nierstrasz, Mircea Lungu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistants</strong></td>
<td>Nevena Milojković, Haidar Osman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lectures</strong></td>
<td>IWI 001, Wednesdays @ 10h15-12h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exercises</strong></td>
<td>IWI 001, Wednesdays @ 12h00-13h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWW</strong></td>
<td>scg.unibe.ch/teaching/sde/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Goals of this course

**Understanding:**
> how and why software evolves
> reflection and metaprogramming
> how to analyze evolving software
> how to enable graceful software evolution
# Course Schedule (tentative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17-Sep-14</td>
<td>Introduction to Software Design and Evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24-Sep-14</td>
<td>Smalltalk: A Reflective Language and System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-Oct-14</td>
<td>Understanding Classes and Metaclasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8-Oct-14</td>
<td>Reflection and Metaprogramming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15-Oct-14</td>
<td>Introduction to Reverse Engineering / Moose Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22-Oct-14</td>
<td>Metrics and Problem Detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29-Oct-14</td>
<td>Architectural Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-Nov-14</td>
<td>Software Visualization / Roassal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-Nov-14</td>
<td>Mining Software Repositories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19-Nov-14</td>
<td>Dynamic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26-Nov-14</td>
<td>Software Ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-Dec-14</td>
<td>The View from Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10-Dec-14</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17-Dec-14</td>
<td><strong>Final exam</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What is a Legacy System?

“legacy”

A sum of money, or a specified article, given to another by will; anything handed down by an ancestor or predecessor.

— Oxford English Dictionary

A **legacy system** is a piece of software that:

- you have *inherited*, and
- is *valuable* to you

Typical **problems** with legacy systems:

- original developers *not available*
- *outdated* development methods used
- extensive patches and *modifications* have been made
- *missing* or outdated documentation

⇒ **so, further evolution and development may be prohibitively expensive**
Software Maintenance - Cost

**Relative Maintenance Effort**
Between 50% and 75% of global effort is spent on “maintenance”!

**Relative Cost of Fixing Mistakes**
- **requirement**: x 1
- **design**: x 5
- **coding**: x 10
- **testing**: x 20
- **delivery**: x 200

**Solution?**
- Better requirements engineering?
- Better software methods & tools (database schemas, CASE-tools, objects, components, …)?
Continuous Development

- 17.4% Corrective (fixing reported errors)
- 18.2% Adaptive (new platforms or OS)
- 60.3% Perfective (new functionality)
- 4.1% Other

The bulk of the maintenance cost is due to new functionality ⇒ even with better requirements, it is hard to predict new functions

data from [Lien78a]
Lehman's Laws

A classic study by Lehman and Belady [Lehm85a] identified several “laws” of system change.

**Continuing change**

> A program that is used in a real-world environment *must change*, or become progressively less useful in that environment.

**Increasing complexity**

> As a program evolves, it becomes *more complex*, and extra resources are needed to preserve and simplify its structure.

*Those laws are still applicable…*
What about Objects?

Object-oriented legacy systems

> = successful OO systems whose architecture and design no longer responds to changing requirements

Compared to traditional legacy systems

> The symptoms and the source of the problems are the same
> The technical details and solutions may differ

OO techniques promise better

> flexibility,
> reusability,
> maintainability
> ...

⇒ they do not come for free
What about Components?
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Modern Methods & Tools ?

[Glás98a] quoting empirical study from Sasa Dekleva (1992)
> Modern methods(*) lead to more reliable software
> Modern methods lead to less frequent software repair
> and ...
> Modern methods lead to more total maintenance time

Contradiction ? No!
• modern methods make it easier to change
   ... this capacity is used to enhance functionality!

(*) process-oriented structured methods, information engineering, data-oriented methods, prototyping, CASE-tools – not OO !
How to deal with Legacy?

New or changing requirements will gradually degrade original design … unless extra development effort is spent to adapt the structure

**New Functionality**

Hack it in?

- duplicated code
- complex conditionals
- abusive inheritance
- large classes/methods

First …
- refactor
- restructure
- reengineer

Take a *loan* on your software ⇒ pay back via reengineering

*Investment* for the future ⇒ paid back during maintenance
Common Symptoms

Lack of Knowledge
- obsolete or no documentation
- departure of the original developers or users
- disappearance of inside knowledge about the system
- limited understanding of entire system
  ⇒ missing tests

Process symptoms
- too long to turn things over to production
- need for constant bug fixes
- maintenance dependencies
- difficulties separating products
  ⇒ simple changes take too long

Code symptoms
- duplicated code
- code smells
  ⇒ big build times
## Common Problems

### Architectural Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insufficient <em>documentation</em></td>
<td>non-existent or out-of-date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improper <em>layering</em></td>
<td>too few or too many layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of <em>modularity</em></td>
<td>strong coupling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>duplicated code</em></td>
<td>copy, paste &amp; edit code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>duplicated functionality</em></td>
<td>similar functionality by separate teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refactoring opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>misuse of inheritance</td>
<td>code reuse vs polymorphism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing inheritance</td>
<td>duplication, case-statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misplaced operations</td>
<td>operations outside classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violation of encapsulation</td>
<td>type-casting; C++ &quot;friends&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class abuse</td>
<td>classes as namespaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to cope with evolution?

> Need to **assess** evolution
> Need to **analyze** software and running systems
> Need to **adapt** evolving software systems
> Need to **enable** evolution, also at runtime
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What is a model?

This slide intentionally left blank.
What is a meta-model?

This slide intentionally left blank
Example from databases

Meta-meta-model

Meta-model «instance-of»

Model «instance-of»

System «represented-by»

Relational data model:
Tables, attributes, tuples

Database schema:
Student, Course, Enrolment …

Database tables of tuples:
(andreas, muster, 07-123-123), …

Real world:
You, MMS, …
A metaprogram is a program that manipulates a program \textit{(possibly itself)}
Reflection

> “Reflection is the ability of a program to *manipulate as data* something representing the *state of the program* during its own execution.

> *Introspection* is the ability for a program to *observe* and therefore *reason* about its own state.

> *Intercession* is the ability for a program to *modify* its own execution state or *alter its own interpretation* or meaning.

Both aspects require a mechanism for encoding execution state as data: this is called *reification*.”

— Bobrow, Gabriel & White, “CLOS in Context”, 1993
Reflection and Reification

Metamodel

Object

«instance of»

anObject

«reification»

«introspection»

("reflection")

Object class

«modification»

Model
Causal connection

> “A system having itself as application domain and that is \textit{causally connected} with this domain can be qualified as a reflective system”

— Maes, OOPSLA 1987

— A reflective system has an \textit{internal representation of itself}.
— A reflective system is able to \textit{act on itself} with the assurance that its representation will be causally connected (up to date).
— A reflective system has some static capacity of \textit{self-representation} and dynamic \textit{self-modification} in constant synchronization
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Smalltalk is still today one of the few fully reflective, fully dynamic, object-oriented development environments.

We will see how a simple, uniform object model enables live, dynamic, interactive software development.
What is Smalltalk?

> **Pure OO language**
  — Single inheritance
  — Dynamically typed

> **Language and environment**
  — Guiding principle: “Everything is an Object”
  — Class browser, debugger, inspector, …
  — Mature class library and tools

> **Virtual machine**
  — Objects exist in a persistent *image* [+ *changes*]
  — Incremental compilation
What is interesting about Smalltalk?

> Everything is an object
> Everything happens by sending messages
> All the source code is there all the time
> You can't lose code
> You can change everything
> You can change things without restarting the system
> The Debugger is your Friend
How does Smalltalk work?
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Metaclasses in 7 points

1. Every object is an instance of a class
2. Every class inherits from Object
3. Every class is an instance of a metaclass
4. The metaclass hierarchy parallels the class hierarchy
5. Every metaclass inherits from Class and Behavior
6. Every metaclass is an instance of Metaclass
7. The metaclass of Metaclass is an instance of Metaclass

Adapted from Goldberg & Robson, *Smalltalk-80 — The Language*
Why is Smalltalk interesting for Software Evolution?

Modeling
(fully OO)

Instrumentation
(dynamic adaptation)

Analysis
(rapid prototyping)
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Some Terminology

“Forward Engineering is the traditional process of moving from high-level abstractions and logical, implementation-independent designs to the physical implementation of a system.”

“Reverse Engineering is the process of analyzing a subject system to identify the system’s components and their interrelationships and create representations of the system in another form or at a higher level of abstraction.”

“Reengineering ... is the examination and alteration of a subject system to reconstitute it in a new form and the subsequent implementation of the new form.”

— Chikofsky and Cross [in Arnold, 1993]
Goals of Reverse Engineering

> Cope with *complexity*
  — need techniques to understand large, complex systems

> Generate *alternative views*
  — automatically generate different ways to view systems

> Recover *lost information*
  — extract what changes have been made and why

> Detect *side effects*
  — help understand ramifications of changes

> Synthesize *higher abstractions*
  — identify latent abstractions in software

> Facilitate *reuse*
  — detect candidate reusable artifacts and components

— Chikofsky and Cross [in Arnold, 1993]
Reverse Engineering Techniques

> Redocumentation
  – pretty printers
  – diagram generators
  – cross-reference listing generators

> Design recovery
  – software metrics
  – browsers, visualization tools
  – static analyzers
  – dynamic (trace) analyzers
Goals of Reengineering

> **Unbundling**
  — split a monolithic system into parts that can be separately marketed

> **Performance**
  — “first do it, then do it right, then do it fast” — experience shows this is the right sequence!

> **Port to other Platform**
  — the architecture must distinguish the platform dependent modules

> **Design extraction**
  — to improve maintainability, portability, etc.

> **Exploitation of New Technology**
  — i.e., new language features, standards, libraries, etc.
Reengineering Techniques

> **Restructuring**
  - automatic conversion from unstructured to structured code
  - source code translation
  
  — *Chikofsky and Cross*

> **Data reengineering**
  - integrating and centralizing multiple databases
  - unifying multiple, inconsistent representations
  - upgrading data models

  — *Sommerville, ch 32*

> **Refactoring**
  - renaming/moving methods/classes etc.
The Reengineering Life-Cycle

- **Requirements**
  - (0) requirement analysis

- **Designs**
  - (2) problem detection

- **Code**
  - (1) model capture

- **(4) program transformation**
  - people centric
  - lightweight

- **(3) problem resolution**
Reverse engineering Patterns

Reverse engineering patterns encode expertise and trade-offs in extracting design from source code, running systems and people.

— Even if design documents exist, they are typically out of sync with reality.

Example: Interview During Demo
Reengineering Patterns

Reengineering patterns encode expertise and trade-offs in transforming legacy code to resolve problems that have emerged.

— These problems are typically not apparent in original design but are due to architectural drift as requirements evolve

Example: Move Behaviour Close to Data
A Map of Reengineering Patterns

Tests: Your Life Insurance

Detailed Model Capture

Initial Understanding

First Contact

Setting Direction

Migration Strategies

Detecting Duplicated Code

Redistribute Responsibilities

Transform Conditionals to Polymorphism
What you should know!

> Software “maintenance” is really *continuous development*

> Real-world programs *must change* or become less useful over time

> What is the relationship between a model and its meta-model?

> What is the difference between reflection and reification? Between introspection and intercession?

> How does Smalltalk differ from Java?

> How does reverse-engineering differ from reengineering?
Can you answer these questions?

- Why do successful software systems always require more maintenance?
- What is a model? A meta-model?
- What kind of “reflection” does Java support?
- In Smalltalk, how can you reflect on the VM?
- How do static and dynamic analysis of software systems differ?
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