Modern issues in design

- Software architecture
  - Families of designs
- Design patterns
  - Common patterns in object-oriented programming
- Open implementations
  - Overcoming shortcomings of black-box design

Software architecture

- An area of significant attention in the last five years
  - Garlan and Shaw
  - Perry and Wolf
- There are two basic goals
  - Capturing, cataloguing, and exploiting experience in software designs
  - Allowing reasoning on classes of designs

An aside: compilers I

- The first compilers had *ad hoc* designs
- Over time, as a number of compilers were built, the designs became more structured
  - Experience yielded benefits
    - Compiler phases, symbol table, etc.
  - Plenty of theoretical advances
    - Finite state machines, parsing, ...

An aside: compilers II

- Compilers are perhaps the best example of shared experience in design
  - Lots of tools that capture common aspects
  - Undergraduate courses build compilers
  - Most compilers look pretty similar in structure
- We still don’t fully generate compilers
Other domains?

- Which other domains are as successful in this regard as compilers?

Back to software architecture

- The hope is that by studying our experiences with a variety of systems, we can gain leverage as we did with compilers
- Capture the strengths and weaknesses of various software structures
  - Perhaps enabling designers to select appropriate architectures more effectively
- Benefit from high-level study of software structure

Components and connectors

- Software architectures are composed of components and connectors
  - Components define the basic computations comprising the system
    - Abstract data types, filters, etc.
  - Connectors define the interconnections between components
    - Procedure call, event announcement, etc.

Architectural style

- Defines the vocabulary of components and connectors for a family (style)
- Constraints on the elements and their combination
  - Topological constraints (no cycles, register/announce relationships, etc.)
  - Execution constraints (timing, etc.)
- By choosing a style, one gets all the known properties of that style
  - For any given architecture in that style

Not just boxes and arrows

- Consider pipes & filters
  - Pipes must compute local transformations
  - Filters must not share state with other filters
  - There must be no cycles
- If these constraints are not satisfied, it’s not a pipe & filter system

Benefits

- In the pipes & filters example, a benefit of the constraints is that deadlock will not arise
  - Again, in any instantiation of the style that satisfies the constraints
- One can think of the constraints as obligations on the designer
  - Some properties can be automatically checked
Specializations

- Architectural styles can have specializations
  - A pipeline might further constrain an architecture to a linear sequence of filters connected by pipes
  - A pipeline would have all properties that the pipe & filter style has, plus more

Well, do they help?

- I like the basic software architecture research as an intellectual tool
  - The work is helping us better understand classes of software structures that have shown themselves as useful
  - Simply improving our shared terminology is a benefit
- It may not be fully distinct from Parnas’s families of systems, but enough to benefit

Open questions I

- What properties can be analyzed?
  - Wright [Allen & Garlan]
    - Reason about architectures in terms of protocols, using a CSP-like language
    - Roughly, type-checking of architectural styles
  - Of these, which are sufficiently important to justify the investment
    - The investment is high, but in theory amortized
  - What about across heterogeneous architectures?

Open questions II

- How does one go from an architectural style to an architecture?
- How does one produce new architectural styles?

Open questions III

- What is the relationship between architectural and implementation?
  - Does architectural information aid in going from design to implementation?
  - What happens as the implementation evolves in ways inconsistent with the architecture?
    - Which properties still hold, and how do we know this?

Experience

- It’s a hot area, with lots of companies paying attention
- Allen & Garlan recently reported on a case study in applying architectural modelling to the AEGIS Weapons System
  - Used formalism to help “expose and resolve some of the architectural problems that arose in implementing the system”
AEGIS Prototype Architecture

On-going research

- Environments to support the design of architectural styles and architectures
- Architectural design languages (ADLs)
- Formal models of architectures
- Architectural case studies
- Use of informal architectures
- ...

Design patterns

- Design patterns are idioms that are intended to be "simple and elegant solutions to specific problems in object-oriented software design."
- They are drawn from actual software systems
- They are intended to be language-independent

A weak analogy

- I view high-level control structures in programming languages as quite the same
  - For example, a while loop is an idiomatic collection of machine instructions
- Knuth’s 1974 article ("Structured Programming with go to Statements") shows that this is not a language issue alone
- Patterns are a collection of “mini-architectures”

Example: flyweight [Gamma et al.]

- Intent
  - Use sharing to support many fine-grained objects efficiently
  - Can’t usually afford to have small elements (like characters) be full-fledged objects
- Separate logical model from physical model

Flyweight structure
Categories of patterns
- Creational
- Structural
- Behavioral

An enlightening experience
- At a workshop a year or two ago, I had an experience with two of the Gang of Four
- They sat down with Griswold and me to show how to use design patterns to (re)design a software architecture we had published
- The rate of communication between these two was unbelievable
  - And much of it was understandable to us without training (good sign for a learning curve)

This is the real thing
- Design patterns are not a silver bullet
- But they are impressive, important and worthy of attention
- I think that (slowly?) some of the patterns will become part and parcel of designers’ vocabularies
  - This will improve communication and over time improve the designs we produce
- The relatively disciplined structure of the pattern descriptions may be a plus

The future
- I’m somewhat worried that “second wave” R&D will hurt more than help
- How do patterns interact?

Patterns resources
- Patterns Home Page
- Portland Pattern Repository
- FAQ
- Gang of Four book
  - Design Patterns: Elements of Reusable Object-Oriented Software. Gamma et. al.
- OO journals, OOPSLA, etc.

Open implementation
- Last week in discussing information hiding I listed some central premises
- Two important ones are especially questionable
- Kiczales et al. have studied this question carefully, leading to some work generally called Open Implementation
Central premises III and IV

- The semantics of the module must remain unchanged when implementations are replaced
  - Specifically, the client should not care how the interface is implemented by the module
- One implementation can satisfy multiple clients
  - Different clients of the same interface that need different implementations would be counter to the principle of information hiding
    » Clients should not care about implementations, as long as they satisfy the interface

These are often false

- What defines the semantics of the interface?
  - Much is not (cannot?) be defined, but is inferred by the client
- Once properties are inferred, clients start to assume that they are true
- Multiple clients may infer different properties
  - So changing those properties consistently may be impossible
- Client do, in practice, care about (aspects of) the implementation

Examples

- The flyweight pattern example points out a few of these issues
- Logically, any implementation of the interface is OK
  - But not all implementations are equally adequate for all clients
- The Kiczales spreadsheet example

Two approaches often taken

- Programmers often respond to these problems in one of two ways
  - Write own windowing system
  - Clever coding tricks
    » Paging example

The experts say

- “I found a large number of programs perform poorly because of the language’s tendency to hide ‘what is going on’ with the misguided intention of ‘not bothering the programmer with details.’”
  - N. Wirth, 1974
- “An interface should capture the minimum essentials of an abstraction.”
- When an interface undertakes to do too much, the result is a large, slow complicated implementation.”
  - B. Lampson, 1984

The OI solution

- Define two interfaces
  - The base interface, which provides the essential semantics
  - The meta-interface, which is used to customize aspects of the implementation of the base
- Based on experience
  - Common Lisp Meta-Object Protocol (CLOS MOP)
  - Reflective computing
Allows the client to

- Use the module’s primary functionality alone when the default implementation is adequate
- Control the module’s implementation-strategy decisions when necessary
- Deal with functionality and implementation strategy decisions in largely separate ways

Design issues: OI claims

- The base interface design requires similar techniques to current interface design
- The design of the meta-interface and of the coupling of the meta- and base interface is more complicated
  - Requires expertise in the definition and uses of the components

Design issues: meta-interface

- Scope control
  - Are controls over the implementation for instances, classes, other?
- Conceptual separation & incrementality
  - Can the client of the meta-interface understand and use just parts of it?
- Robustness
  - Are bugs in a client’s meta-program limited in effect?

It’s not an entirely new idea

- Compiler pragmas
- Multiple implementations of an interface
  - With client choice [Hermes]
- User-directed parallelization
- Unix madvise
  - Influence page replacement
- Many more

Ongoing

- Examples
- Design guidelines
- Analysis techniques

Frameworks

- Frameworks are another design buzzword
- One way to think about them is as upside-down layers
  - That is, layered systems allow us to construct families of systems by sharing lower layers
  - Frameworks allow us to construct families of systems by sharing upper “layers”
- Instantiate and specialize provided classes
  - “More” than patterns
More frameworks

- User interface frameworks (MVC, HotDraw, ...)
- Distributed systems
- Network protocols
- More information
  - http://www.ide.hk-r.se/frameworks/frameworks.html