

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Lecture 21: Software Evolution

- **Basics of Software Evolution**
  - ↳ Laws of software evolution
  - ↳ Requirements Growth
  - ↳ Software Aging
- **Basics of Change Management**
  - ↳ Baselines, Change Requests and Configuration Management
- **Software Families - The product line approach**
- **Requirements Traceability**
  - ↳ Importance of traceability
  - ↳ Traceability tools

© Easterbrook 2004 1

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Program Types

Source: Adapted from Lehman 1980, pp1061-1063

- **S-type Programs ("Specifiable")**
  - ↳ problem can be stated formally and completely
  - ↳ acceptance: Is the program correct according to its specification?
  - ↳ This software does not evolve.
    - A change to the specification defines a new problem, hence a new program
- **P-type Programs ("Problem-solving")**
  - ↳ imprecise statement of a real-world problem
  - ↳ acceptance: Is the program an acceptable solution to the problem?
  - ↳ This software is likely to evolve continuously
    - because the solution is never perfect, and can be improved
    - because the real-world changes and hence the problem changes
- **E-type Programs ("Embedded")**
  - ↳ A system that becomes part of the world that it models
  - ↳ acceptance: depends entirely on opinion and judgement
  - ↳ This software is inherently evolutionary
    - changes in the software and the world affect each other

© Easterbrook 2004 2

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

Source: Adapted from Lehman 1980, pp1061-1063

The diagrams illustrate the relationships between the real world, formal statements, programs, and solutions for different program types:

- S-type:** A formal statement of problem (text box) leads to a PROGRAM (text box), which provides a solution (text box). A real world (cloud) may relate to the formal statement and maybe of interest to the solution.
- P-type:** A real world (cloud) leads to an abstract view of world (text box), which leads to requirements specification (text box), then a PROGRAM (text box), which provides a solution (text box). A change (circle) leads to the real world, and a compare (circle) leads to requirements specification.
- E-type:** A real world (cloud) leads to an abstract view of world (text box), which leads to a model (text box), which leads to requirements specification (text box), then a PROGRAM (text box), which provides a solution (text box). A change (circle) leads to the real world.

© Easterbrook 2004 3

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Laws of Program Evolution

Source: Adapted from Lehman 1980, pp1061-1063

- **Continuing Change**
  - ↳ Any software that *reflects some external reality* undergoes continual change or becomes progressively less useful
    - change continues until it is judged more cost effective to replace the system
- **Increasing Complexity**
  - ↳ As software evolves, its *complexity* increases...
    - ...unless steps are taken to control it.
- **Fundamental Law of Program Evolution**
  - ↳ Software evolution is self-regulating
    - ...with statistically determinable trends and invariants
- **Conservation of Organizational Stability**
  - ↳ During the active life of a software system, the work output of a development project is roughly constant (regardless of resources!)
- **Conservation of Familiarity**
  - ↳ The amount of change in successive releases is roughly constant

© Easterbrook 2004 4

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Requirements Growth

Source: Adapted from Davis 1988, pp1453-1455

→ **Davis's model:**

- ☞ User needs evolve continuously
  - Imagine a graph showing growth of needs over time
  - May not be linear or continuous (hence no scale shown)
- ☞ Traditional development always lags behind needs growth
  - first release implements only part of the original requirements
  - functional enhancement adds new functionality
  - eventually, further enhancement becomes too costly, and a replacement is planned
  - the replacement also only implements part of its requirements,
  - and so on...

© Easterbrook 2004 5

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Alternative lifecycle models

Source: Adapted from Davis 1988, pp1455-1459

© Easterbrook 2004 6

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Software "maintenance"

Source: Adapted from Blum, 1992, p492-495

→ **Maintenance philosophies**

- ☞ "throw-it-over-the-wall" - someone else is responsible for maintenance
  - investment in knowledge and experience is lost
  - maintenance becomes a reverse engineering challenge
- ☞ "mission orientation" - development team make a long term commitment to maintaining/enhancing the software

→ **Basili's maintenance process models:**

- ☞ Quick-fix model
  - changes made at the code level, as easily as possible
  - rapidly degrades the structure of the software
- ☞ Iterative enhancement model
  - Changes made based on an analysis of the existing system
  - attempts to control complexity and maintain good design
- ☞ Full-reuse model
  - Starts with requirements for the new system, reusing as much as possible
  - Needs a mature reuse culture to be successful

© Easterbrook 2004 7

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Software Aging

Source: Adapted from Parnas, 1994

→ **Causes of Software Aging**

- ☞ Failure to update the software to meet changing needs
  - Customers switch to a new product if benefits outweigh switching costs
- ☞ Changes to software tend to reduce its coherence

→ **Costs of Software Aging**

- ☞ Owners of aging software find it hard to keep up with the marketplace
- ☞ Deterioration in space/time performance due to deteriorating structure
- ☞ Aging software gets more buggy
  - Each "bug fix" introduces more errors than it fixes

→ **Ways of Increasing Longevity**

- ☞ Design for change
- ☞ Document the software carefully
- ☞ Requirements and designs should be reviewed by those responsible for its maintenance
- ☞ Software Rejuvenation...

© Easterbrook 2004 8



## Managing Requirements Change

### → Managers need to respond to requirements change

- ↳ Add new requirements during development
  - But not succumbing to feature creep
- ↳ Modify requirements during development
  - Because development is a learning process
- ↳ Remove requirements during development
  - requirements "scrub" for handling cost/schedule slippage

### → Key techniques

- ↳ Change Management Process
- ↳ Release Planning
- ↳ Requirements Prioritization (previous lecture)
- ↳ Requirements Traceability
- ↳ Architectural Stability (next week's lecture)



## Change Management

### → Configuration Management

- ↳ Each distinct product is a Configuration Item (CI)
- ↳ Each configuration item is placed under version control
- ↳ Control which version of each CI belongs in which build of the system

### → Baselines

- ↳ A baseline is a stable version of a document or system
  - Safe to share among the team
- ↳ Formal approval process for changes to be incorporated into the next baseline

### → Change Management Process

- ↳ All proposed changes are submitted formally as change requests
- ↳ A review board reviews these periodically and decides which to accept
  - Review board also considers interaction between change requests



## Towards Software Families

### → Libraries of Reusable Components

- ↳ domain specific libraries (e.g. Math libraries)
- ↳ program development libraries (e.g. Java AWT, C libraries)

### → Domain Engineering

- ↳ Divides software development into two parts:
  - domain analysis - identifies generic reusable components for a problem domain
  - application development - uses the domain components for specific applications.

### → Software Families

- ↳ Many companies offer a range of related software systems
  - Choose a stable architecture for the software family
  - identify variations for different members of the family
- ↳ Represents a strategic business decision about what software to develop
- ↳ Vertical families
  - e.g. 'basic', 'deluxe' and 'pro' versions of a system
- ↳ Horizontal families
  - similar systems used in related domains



## Requirements Traceability

### → From IEEE-STD-830:

- ↳ Backward traceability
  - i.e. to previous stages of development.
  - the origin of each requirement should be clear
- ↳ Forward traceability
  - i.e., to all documents spawned by the SRS.
  - Facilitation of referencing of each requirement in future documentation
  - depends upon each requirement having a unique name or reference number.

### → From DOD-STD-2167A:

- ↳ A requirements specification is traceable if:
  - (1) it contains or implements all applicable stipulations in predecessor document
  - (2) a given term, acronym, or abbreviation means the same thing in all documents
  - (3) a given item or concept is referred to by the same name in the documents
  - (4) all material in the successor document has its basis in the predecessor document, that is, no untraceable material has been introduced
  - (5) the two documents do not contradict one another"

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Importance of Traceability

- **Verification and Validation**
  - ↳ assessing adequacy of test suite
  - ↳ assessing conformance to requirements
  - ↳ assessing completeness, consistency, impact analysis
  - ↳ assessing over- and under-design
  - ↳ investigating high level behavior impact on detailed specifications
  - ↳ detecting requirements conflicts
  - ↳ checking consistency of decision making across the lifecycle
- **Maintenance**
  - ↳ Assessing change requests
  - ↳ Tracing design rationale
- **Document access**
  - ↳ ability to find information quickly in large documents
- **Process visibility**
  - ↳ ability to see how the software was developed
  - ↳ provides an audit trail
- **Management**
  - ↳ change management
  - ↳ risk management
  - ↳ control of the development process

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Palmer, 1996, p365 13

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Traceability Difficulties

- **Cost**
  - ↳ very little automated support
  - ↳ full traceability is very expensive and time-consuming
- **Delayed gratification**
  - ↳ the people defining traceability links are not the people who benefit from it
    - > development vs. V&V
  - ↳ much of the benefit comes late in the lifecycle
    - > testing, integration, maintenance
- **Size and diversity**
  - ↳ Huge range of different document types, tools, decisions, responsibilities, ...
  - ↳ No common schema exists for classifying and cataloging these
  - ↳ In practice, traceability concentrates only on baselined requirements

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Palmer, 1996, p365-6 14

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Current Practice

- **Coverage:**
  - ↳ links from requirements forward to designs, code, test cases,
  - ↳ links back from designs, code, test cases to requirements
  - ↳ links between requirements at different levels
- **Traceability process**
  - ↳ Assign each sentence or paragraph a unique id number
  - ↳ Manually identify linkages
  - ↳ Use manual tables to record linkages in a document
  - ↳ Use a traceability tool (database) for project wide traceability
  - ↳ Tool then offers ability to
    - > follow links
    - > find missing links
    - > measure overall traceability

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Palmer, 1996, p367-8 15

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Limitations of Current Tools

- **Informational Problems**
  - ↳ Tools fail to track *useful* traceability information
    - > e.g cannot answer queries such as "who is responsible for this piece of information?"
  - ↳ inadequate pre-requirements traceability
    - > "where did this requirement come from?"
- **Lack of agreement...**
  - ↳ ...over the quantity and type of information to trace
- **Informal Communication**
  - ↳ People attach great importance to personal contact and informal communication
    - > These always supplement what is recorded in a traceability database
  - ↳ But then the traceability database only tells part of the story!
    - > Even so, finding the appropriate people is a significant problem

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Gotel & Finkelstein, 1993, p100 16



## Problematic Questions

### → Involvement

- ↳ Who has been involved in the production of this requirement and how?

### → Responsibility & Remit

- ↳ Who is responsible for this requirement?
  - > who is currently responsible for it?
  - > at what points in its life has this responsibility changed hands?
- ↳ Within which group's remit are decisions about this requirement?

### → Change

- ↳ At what points in the life of this requirements has working arrangements of all involved been changed?

### → Notification

- ↳ Who needs to be involved in, or informed of, any changes proposed to this requirement?

### → Loss of knowledge

- ↳ What are the ramifications regarding the loss of project knowledge if a specific individual or group leaves?