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Examples of Software Product Lines

- Mobile OS
- Linux Kernel
- Control Software
Resources
“A software product line (SPL) is a set of software-intensive systems that share a common, managed set of features satisfying the specific needs of a particular market segment or mission and that are developed from a common set of core assets in a prescribed way.”
Advantages of SPLs

- Tailor-made software
- Reduced cost
- Improved quality
- Reduced time to market

SPLs are ubiquitous
Challenges of SPLs

• Upfront cost for preparing reusable parts
• Deciding which products you can produce early on
• Thinking about multiple products at the same time
• Managing/testing/analyzing multiple products
Feature-oriented SPLs

Thinking of your product line in terms of the features offered.
Examples of a Feature (Graph Product Line)

- Feature: edge color
- Feature: edge type (directed vs. undirected)
- Feature: cycle detection
Examples of a Feature

(*Collections* Product Line)

- Serializable
- Cloneable
- Growable/Shrinkable/Subtractable/Clearable
- Traversable/Iterable
- Supports parallel processing
A feature is a characteristic or end-user-visible behavior of a software system. Features are used in product-line engineering to specify and communicate commonalities and differences of the products between stakeholders, and to guide structure, reuse, and variation across all phases of the software life cycle.
What features would a Smartphone SPL contain?
Feature Dependencies

Constraints on the possible feature selections!

- feature: edge type (directed)
- feature: cycle detection

depends on
A **product** of a product line is specified by a *valid feature selection* (a subset of the features of the product line). A feature selection is valid if and only if it fulfills all feature dependencies.
Valid Products

Feature Dependencies

- Feature: edge type (directed) depends on feature: cycle detection

Product Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edge Color</th>
<th>Directed Edge</th>
<th>Cycle Detection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valid Products

Feature Dependencies

- feature: edge type (directed)
- feature: cycle detection

Product Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edge Color</th>
<th>Directed Edge</th>
<th>Cycle Detection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product 2 is not valid.
Identify feature dependencies in a Smartphone SPL?

Discussion
In the past, software product lines have been developed for a wide variety of domains, including operating systems, database systems, middleware, automotive software, compilers, healthcare applications, and many more. The broader the domain of a product line is, the larger is the number of possible stakeholders' requirements that can be covered in the form of individually tailored products. However, the broader the domain, the smaller is the set of similarities among products. For example, the domain of system software is huge, which includes operating systems, drivers, network software, database systems, and many more. Although there are similarities that could be exploited in system software, individual systems have substantial differences, which decrease potential for reuse. Focusing on the (sub)domain of database systems or even embedded database systems, increases the reuse potential, while keeping maintenance effort acceptable. The bottom-line is that a proper scoping of the target domain is essential, as we discuss further in Sect. 2.2.1.

Adapted processes for software product lines have to take these peculiarities into account. Two issues play a crucial role: the explicit handling of variability and the systematic reuse of implementation artifacts. For both, an appropriate structuring of process and software artifacts is imperative. The specific characteristics of software product lines lead to a separation between domain engineering and application engineering and between problem space and solution space. In Fig. 2.1, we illustrate a two-dimensional structure with four clusters of tasks in product-line development and the mappings between them, which we explain next.
Software Product Line Engineering

Fig. 2.1 Overview of an engineering process for software product lines

In the past, software product lines have been developed for a wide variety of domains, including operating systems, database systems, middleware, automotive software, compilers, healthcare applications, and many more. The broader the domain of a product line is the larger is the number of possible stakeholders' requirements that can be covered in the form of individually tailored products. However, the broader the domain, the smaller is the set of similarities among products. For example, the domain of system software is huge, which includes operating systems, drivers, network software, database systems, and many more. Although there are similarities that could be exploited in system software, individual systems have substantial differences, which decrease potential for reuse. Focusing on the (sub)domain of database systems or even embedded database systems, increases the reuse potential, while keeping maintenance effort acceptable. The bottom-line is that a proper scoping of the target domain is essential, as we discuss further in Sect. 2.2.1.

Ad e v e l o p m e n t p r o c e s s f o r s o f t w a r e p r o d u c t l i n e s h a s t o t a k e t h e s e p e c u l i a r i t i e s into account. Two issues play a crucial role: the explicit handling of variability and the systematic reuse of implementation artifacts. For both, an appropriate structuring of process and software artifacts is imperative.

The specific characteristics of software product lines lead to a separation between domain engineering and application engineering and between problem space and solution space. In Fig. 2.1, we illustrate a two-dimensional structure with four clusters of tasks in product-line development and the mappings between them, which we explain next.

**Development for reuse**
- Analyze domain & develop reusable artifacts
- Does not result in a specific product
- Prepares artifacts to be used in various products

**Development with reuse**
- Develop specific product for needs of a particular customer
- Repeated for every derived product
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Domain Analysis

• Domain scoping
  Deciding on product line’s extent or range

• Domain modeling
  • Captures & documents the commonalities & variabilities of the scoped domain
  • Often captured in a feature model
Feature Model

- Document the features of a product line & their relationships
- Can be translated into propositional logic
Graph Library
Feature Model

Mandatory Feature
Edge Type ⇔ Graph Library

Edge Type
Directed
Undirected

Search
BFS
DFS

Cyle
Shortest Path

Weighted

Algorithm
MST
Transpose

Optional Feature
Algorithm ⇒ Graph Library

OR Group
(at least one has to be selected)

XOR Group
(exactly one has to be selected)

Cross-tree Constraints

MST ⇒ Undirected ∧ Weighted
Cycle ⇒ Directed

Prim
Kruskal
root(GraphLibrary)
∧ mandatory(GraphLibrary, EdgeType)
∧ optional(GraphLibrary, Search)
∧ optional(GraphLibrary, Weighted)
∧ or(Search, {BFS, DFS})
…
∧ alternative(MST, {Prim, Kruskal})
∧ (MST ⇒ Weighted)
∧ (Cycle ⇒ Directed)
∧ (∧ … )
Domain Implementation

- Underlying code must be variable
- Dimensions of implementation techniques
  - Binding times: compile-time binding, load-time binding and run-time binding.
  - Representation: annotation vs composition
Domain Implementation
(Representation)

Annotation-based Approach

Composition-based Approach
Variability Implementation

- Parameters
- Design patterns
- Build systems
- Preprocessors
  - *Feature-oriented programming*
Variability Implementation Parameters

- simple
- flexible
- language support
- code bloat
- computing overhead
- non-modular solution
Variability Implementation
Design Patterns

★ well established

★ easy to communicate design decisions

- architecture overhead

- need to preplan extensions
Variability Implementation

Build Systems

★ simple if features can be mapped into files

★ can control other types of parameters

- code duplication if finer level of granularity needed

- hard to analyze
Variability Implementation
Preprocessors

- Easy to use, well-known
- Compile-time customization removes unnecessary code
- Supports arbitrary levels of granularity
  - No separation of concerns (lots of scattering & tangling)
  - Can be used in an undisciplined fashion
  - Prone to simple (syntactic) errors
Variability Implementation
Feature-Oriented Programming

- easy-to-use language mechanism, requiring minimal language extensions

- compile-time customization of source code

- direct feature traceability from a feature to its implementation

  - requires composition tools

  - granularity at level of methods

  - only academic tools so far, little experience in practice
Research Topics

• feature-model reengineering/extraction from existing code

• detecting inconsistencies between the feature-model and its "implementation"

• feature interactions - intended vs. unintended?
Abstract
Implementations of static analyses are usually tailored toward a single goal to be efficient, hampering reusability and adaptability of the components of an analysis. To solve these issues, we propose to implement static analyses as highly-configurable software product lines (SPLs). Furthermore, we also discuss an implementation of an SPL for static analyses called OPAL – that uses advanced language features offered by the Scala programming language to get an easily adaptable and (type-)safe software product line. OPAL is a general purpose library for static analysis of Java Bytecode that is already successfully used. We present OPAL and show how a design based on software produce line engineering benefits the implementation of static analyses with the framework.

Categories and Subject Descriptors F.3.2 [Logics and Meanings of Programs]: Semantics of Programming Languages—Program analysis

General Terms Design, Languages, Program analysis

Keywords Static analysis, Design, Software Product Line Engineering, Abstract Interpretation

1. Introduction
When designing static analyses we aim for efficiency and scalability so that the analyses can tackle reasonable and therefore interesting problems. In order to achieve these design goals static analyses are usually tailored toward solving a single, specific set of problems and therefore often lack generality and reusability. In order to foster reusability and make specific analyses usable in a broader context, static analyses need to be more adaptable and require better support for variability without sacrificing performance.

A well-known approach to address variability in a managed fashion is software product line engineering (SPLE). We propose to design and implement static analysis frameworks as product lines in order to foster reuse of analysis components and allow for tailored but generally useful analyses.

In this paper we present OPAL, a framework for the static analysis of Java Bytecode which implements a software product line for the systematic creation of tailored static analyses. OPAL was designed to satisfy both fundamental requirements: (1) easy customizability and reusability as well as (2) performance and scalability. It uses state-of-the-art programming language abstraction from Scala to foster the development of new static analyses.

The OPAL Framework currently offers two variation points where analyses can be configured to specific requirements. First, the representation of Bytecode can be configured to the exact needs of the analysis in order to save resources and to support tools that have different requirements on the basic representation. Second, OPAL can be configured to run basic analyses in order to help higher-level static analyses by means of abstract interpretation.

The contributions of this paper are:

• An approach for designing static analysis frameworks based on software product line engineering.
• OPAL, a reference implementation for this design approach, which supports multiple representations for Java Bytecode as well as the configuration and adaptation of the performed static analyses to the needs of some user-developed higher-level static analysis.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Motivating our work, we extend on related work in Section 2. In Section 3, we present a short introduction into software product line engineering. We provide a short introduction into the OPAL framework in Section 4. After that, we discuss OPAL’s design w.r.t. its support for software product lines. The section ends with a discussion how it can be used to develop specifically tailored static analyses. In Section 6, we show an example where OPAL has already proven beneficial for the implementation of an analysis. We conclude the work in Section 7 with a summary and ideas for possible future work.

2. Related Work
In general, the idea of developing single, basic static analyses such that they are (re)usable is commonplace. But systematic reusability and composability of basic static analyses with well-/formally defined extension and variation points is not regularly addressed. An example of a step in that direction is, for example, the work on the generic framework for call graph algorithms done by Grove et al. [15]. They developed a framework that makes it possible to systematically configure the call graph construction algorithm. However, the primary purpose of that framework was to compare different call graph algorithms and not to provide a foundation for other developers of static analyses.

A second example of a framework that is related to our work is Julia developed by Fausto Spotts et al.[13]. This framework for
A Software Product Line for Static Analyses

- **Commonalities**
  - we need to be able to process .class files

- **Variability**
  - enable different representation for .class files (e.g., if you want to write a disassembler a 1:1 representation is needed; for most static analyses a more abstract representation is required.)
  - only reify those parts that are needed

**Case Study**

Requirement: composition based approach
Processing Java `.class` Files
Processing Java .class Files

Base Trait which defines the general infrastructure.

```scala
trait ClassFileReader{
  /* Abstract over the representation of the ... */
  type ClassFile
  type Constant_Pool
  type Fields
  type Methods
  type Attributes

  ... /* Methods to read in the respective data structures. */
  def Constant_Pool(in: DataInputStream): Constant_Pool
  def Fields(in: DataInputStream, cp: Constant_Pool): Fields
  def Methods(in: DataInputStream, cp: Constant_Pool): Methods

  ... /* Factory method to create a representation of a Class File. */
  def ClassFile(
    ... // Version information, defined type, etc.
    fields: Fields,
    methods: Methods,
    attributes: Attributes)(implicit cp: Constant_Pool): ClassFile

  def ClassFile(in: DataInputStream): ClassFile = {
    // read magic and version information
    val cp = Constant_Pool(in)
    val fields = Fields(in,cp)
    val methods = Methods(in,cp)
    val attributes = Attributes(in,cp)
    // call factory method
    ClassFile(...,fields,methods,attributes)(cp)
  }
}
```
Processing Java .class Files

Trait which implements the MethodsReader feature!

```scala
trait MethodsBinding extends MethodsReader {
  this: ConstantPoolBinding with AttributeBinding =>

type Method_Info = de.tud.cs.st.bat.resolved.Method

def Method_Info(
  accessFlags: Int, 
  name: Int, 
  descriptor: Int, 
  attributes: Attributes
)(implicit cp: Constant_Pool): Method_Info =
  create Method representation
}
```

reified cross-tree constraint
Processing Java .class Files

Product configurations

class Java7ClassFilesPublicInterface
  extends ClassFileBinding
  with ConstantPoolBinding
  with FieldsBinding
  with MethodsBinding
  with AttributesReader
  with SkipUnknown_attributeReader
  with AnnotationsBinding
  with InnerClasses_attributeBinding
  with InterfacesBinding
  // further attributes related to a class' public interface

class Java7ClassFiles
  extends Java7ClassFilesPublicInterface
  with CodeAttributeBinding
  with StackMapTable_attributeBinding
  with LineNumberTable_attributeBinding
  with LocalVariableTable_attributeBinding
  with BootstrapMethods_attributeBinding
  // further code related attributes
Analyzing Methods
(Implemented using a second product line; which supports several products of the first product line.)
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Abstract. In general, components provide and require services and two components are bound if the first component provides a service required by the second component. However, certain variability in services – w.r.t. how and which functionality is provided or required – cannot be described using standard interface description languages. If this variability is relevant when selecting a matching component then human interaction is required to decide which components can be bound. We propose to use feature models for making this variability explicit and (re-)enabling automatic component binding. In our approach, feature models are one part of service specifications. This enables to declaratively specify which service variant is provided by a component. By referring to a service’s variation points, a component that requires a specific service can list the requirements on the desired variant. Using these specifications, a component environment can then determine if a binding of the components exists that satisfies all requirements. The prototypical environment Columbus demonstrates the feasibility of the approach.

1 Introduction

Components in a component-based system may provide and require multiple services, whereby each service is described by a service specification. A component that provides a specific service declares to do so by implementing the interface defined by the service specification. This approach of “programming against interfaces” enables low coupling and flexible designs that are malleable.

Current interface description languages (Java interfaces, WSDL interfaces, etc.) are geared towards describing commonalities between components and hiding their variabilities. However, in an open component environment, several components may co-exist that do implement the same programmatic interface, but with varying characteristics of their implementations regarding functional as well as non-functional properties. For example, it is possible that two components implementing two Payment Web Services expose exactly the same programmatic interface, but do support a different set of credit card vendors, use different security algorithms and have different levels of reliability. The description of the interface using, e.g., the Web Service Description Language (WSDL), only specifies how to interact with a web service; i.e., the data types that have to be used, the order in which the messages have to be exchanged, the transport protocol