

SENSORIA Results Applied to the Case Studies

(\approx deliverable D8.8)

Maurice ter Beek

ISTI-CNR, Pisa, Italy

SENSORIA general meeting
 Milan, 25 November 2009



- 1 Scope
- 2 Contributions
- 3 Validation: synthetic overview
- 4 Experience/benefits: analytic overviews
- 5 Conclusions



Emphasize the central role of the case studies in *feeding* and *steering* the research in SENSORIA

- No description of the case studies
- No details of the techniques, methods and languages
- Not limited to the Finance case study, but consider applications also to the other four case studies from WP8:
 - Automotive, eUniversity, Telecommunications and Bowling Robot

Describe the experience/benefits of applying a particular technique, method or language to a case study scenario and *not* the technique, method or language itself, which is presented in the other chapters

- Deliverable D8.8 will be limited to the applications *after* M36, book chapter hence based on D8.5/D8.6/D8.7 from M36 and D8.8 from ~~M48~~ M54



Call for contributions same for all deliverables D8.5/D8.6/D8.7/D8.8

Aim: Besides validating the technique, method or language against requirements of the case study, was there a specific *aim* that triggered the use of the case study?

Experience: Which were the *problems* (if any) faced when applying the technique, method or language to the case study and what are the *results* that have been obtained?

Benefits: What have been the *advantages* (from the engineering, scientific or business point of view) of applying the technique, method or language to the case study?

Feedback: Did the application of the technique, method or language to the case study lead to *improvements* of that technique, method or language?



Validation of SENSORIA techniques, methods and languages

| | Automotive | Finance | eUniversity | Bowling Robot | Telco |
|-----------------|------------|---------|-------------|---------------|-------|
| UML4SOA | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SRML | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| StPowla | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| COWS | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| SOCK/Jolie | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| (Mar)CaSPiS | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| CC | | ✓ | | | |
| λ^{req} | ✓ | | | | |
| CaPiTo | | ✓ | | | |
| SRMC | | | ✓ | | |
| cc-pi | | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| ADR | ✓ | | | | |
| Institutions | | | ✓ | | |
| SocL | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| CMC-UMC | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| chorSLMC | | ✓ | | | |
| Flow logic | | ✓ | | | |
| SC-ESC | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| OCPR | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| WS-Engineer | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| SoSL/MoSL | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| PEPA toolkit | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Modes/Dino | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| JCaSPiS | | ✓ | | | |
| MDD4SOA | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| VIATRA2 | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| GT | | ✓ | | | |
| MBTE | | ✓ | | | |
| Patterns | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| SDE | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |



- Clearly illustrates the central role of the industrial case studies from the Automotive and—in particular—Finance domain, and the more specific role of the academic eUniversity case study

- It moreover shows that only a few of the SENSORIA techniques, methods and languages have been applied to the Bowling Robot and Telecommunications case studies:
 1. Telecommunications case study has suffered from the fact that Telecom Italia has left the SENSORIA consortium by end of M18

 2. The Bowling Robot case study has been introduced around M36; initially as a game scenario to demonstrate SENSORIA's software engineering approach at hands-on demonstrations, after which it has evolved into an academic case study



Theme 1: Linguistic Primitives (WP1, WP2 & WP5)

- Deals with *linguistic primitives* for services and their interaction and composition, developed both on an *architectural* level (e.g. UML4SOA, SRML) and on a *programming* level (e.g. COWS, SOCK, Jolie, CaSPiS, CC)

Theme 2: Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis (WP3 & WP4)

- Deals with *type systems* (e.g. λ^{req}), *logics* (e.g. SoCL, SoSL) and core calculi *extensions* (e.g. MarCaSPiS) to develop verification techniques (e.g. CMC/UMC, ChorSLMC, PEPA SW toolkit) to *analyse* behavioural, performance and QoS properties of services

Theme 3: Deployment and Development (WP6 & WP7)

- Deals with engineering aspects of services: *deployment* (e.g. Modes, Dino, JCaSPiS, VIATRA2), *reengineering* (e.g. graph transformations) and *model-driven development* (e.g. MDD4SOA, SDE)



Theme 1: experience/benefits of SENSORIA techniques, methods and languages

| Theme 1 | Automotive | Finance | eUniversity | Bowling Robot | Telco |
|-----------------|---|--|--|---------------|---|
| UML4SOA | Test its usefulness in practice; Provide models for formal verification | | | | |
| SRML | Validate primitives, 3-layer approach, def.SLA | | | | |
| StPowla | | Validate approach; Now aut. derives policy templates | | | Assess impact business pro- cess design |
| COWS | Feasibility mechanisms & primitives for SOA | | | | |
| SOCK | Validate primitives & faults/compensations modelling; Verify dynamic handler & aut. fault notification; Now improved handlers | | | | |
| Jolie | Test service-oriented programming; Found new SOA patterns | | | | |
| (Mar)CaSPiS | Test effectiveness & Markovian extension | | | Feasibility | |
| CC | | Type to verify key properties | | | |
| λ^{req} | Orchestrate with policies & contracts | | | | |
| CaPiTo | | Model SOA espe- cially when security by crypto protocols | | | |
| SRMC | | | Test expressivity; Novel analysis ap- proach created | | |
| ADR | Disambiguate infor- mal spec. by formal model reconfigura- tions & constraints | | | | |
| Institutions | | | Validate approach; Separate behavioral description services from choreography | | |



Theme 2: experience/benefits of SENSORIA techniques, methods and languages

| Theme 2 | Automotive | Finance | eUniversity | Bowling Robot | Telco |
|-------------|--|---|-------------|---|-------|
| StPowla | Detection of conflicts by theorem proving; Needed extension Appel semantics | Detection of conflicts by UMC; Needed definition of correspondence Appel-UML | | | |
| SocL | Test expressivity for SOA properties; Defined patterns of service properties | | | | |
| CMC | Test & fine-tune model checker; Verify properties; Feasibility type checking; Now automated translation from UML4SOA to COWS | | | | |
| UMC | Test & fine-tune model checker; Verify properties; Now automated translation from UML4SOA into UMC | | | Test & fine-tune model checker; Verify properties | |
| CaSPiS | | Type system to check progress property; Control flow analysis to detect & prevent misuses | | | |
| chorSLMC | | Verify multiparty interaction; Proved protocols of interaction well-defined & deadlock-free | | | |
| SC-ESC | Experiment, evaluate & reason about long running transactions | | | | |
| Flow logic | | Proved authenticity & confidentiality | | | |
| OCPR | Defined compositional notion of service equivalence; Verified service equivalence & replaceability | | | | |
| WS-Engineer | Analyzed correctness & consistency of service compositions; Helped to further develop the tool | | | Test & further develop tool | |

continued on next slide...



Theme 2: experience/benefits of SENSORIA techniques, methods and languages – cont'd

| Theme 2 | Automotive | Finance | eUniversity | Bowling Robot | Telco |
|-----------------|---|--|---|--|-------|
| SoSL | | Test expressivity for SOC features; Verify workload, reactivity & performance | | Show methodology provides intuitive & effective estimations of robot behaviour | |
| MoSL | Validate expressivity dependability & performance properties of services: difficult & error-prone in natural language | | | | |
| λ^{req} | Use output model checker to highlight design flaws, suggesting how to revise orchestration & security policies | | | | |
| PEPA toolkit | Passage-end, response-time & safety analysis; Development environment now more user-friendly | Sensitivity & response-time analysis to identify bottleneck activity; technically particularly challenging | Show main developments PEPA wrt deterministic semantics; Key benefit of PEPA: both a deterministic & a stochastic semantics | Passage-end analysis: precisely quantified probability of expected outcome | |
| SRMC | | Test software tool suite; Verify scalability in presence of uncertainties | | | |



Theme 3: experience/benefits of SENSORIA techniques, methods and languages

| Theme 3 | Automotive | Finance | eUniversity | Telco |
|----------|---|---|-------------|-------|
| Modes | Test modelling orchestration & choreography requirements; Created UML2 profile; Extended analysis & WS-Engineer | | | |
| Dino | Provide requirements, guide design & validate Dino; Now improved & extended design | | | |
| JCaSPiS | | Implement real-world scenario; Preserve analysis modelling to implementation level; Now new functionalities | | |
| MDD4SOA | Validate practicability UML4SOA & usefulness MDD4SOA transformers in practice (by full transformation from UML4SOA to actual code & execution); Developed hand in hand with UML4SOA; Transformers now provide more readable & precise error reporting | | | |
| VIATRA2 | Test method; Support incremental service development & re-usability; XML descriptors created automatically | | | |
| GT | | Untangle business & presentation logic; New rule set; Architecture migration now automated | | |
| MBTE | | Test method; Steered better user guiding | | |
| Patterns | Accompanied by examples from the case study application that identified pattern; Created pattern catalogue documenting (dis)advantages & feedback of approaches | | | |
| SDE | Orchestration features employed to combine integrated tools for development & analysis of case studies; Now contains all SENSORIA tools; Now improved SDE interfaces & graphical orchestration mechanism | | | |



- If your technique, method, or language is missing: please send me your contribution asap...

- Overviews available for review:
 1. Present synthetic overview to show central role of case studies
 2. Present analytic overview only of SENSORIA's "main" (which?) techniques, methods and languages

- Thanks to all the SENSORIA partners for their contributions!!!

