

Validation-Driven Development





Sebastian Stock, Atif Mashkoor

Typical modeling experience

• Formal specification part of the RE

- Modeling via experience
 - Structure of specification
 - When to validate something
- Verification
 - It the specification consistent?
 - Proving or MC
 - Main focus
- Validation?



Validation

- The "unloved" child
 - Late
 - Experience decides
- Consistency, completeness, tracing & maintenance of requirements
- Informale components?
- Involving all stakeholders
 - As a good RE component should
 - Showing them they get what they want
 - Late involvement produces late feedback

JYU JOHANNES KEPLER UNIVERSITY LINZ

Global challenges

- Rely less on experience of individuals
 - Reproducible decisions
 - Without reading documentation (that does often not exist in the first place)
- Specification structure
 - What to validate together?
 - What breaks what part?
 - What gives greatest benefit?



Challenges - Specification level

- Consistency & Completeness
 - Measure this?
 - Hard when we validate a finished model
- Tracing & Maintenance
 - Point to the right part
 - Notice if something breaks



Solution = VDD

- Provides heuristic for specification structure
 - When to refine
 - How to refine
 - Calculating the advantages for a refinement step
- Uses VOs for
 - Consistency & Completeness
 - Tracing & Maintenance
- Bonus: Less experience needed





Specification structure - Problem frames

• AMAN is the goal





Specification structure - Problem frames

• AMAN is the goal





Specification structure - Problem frames

- AMAN is the goal
- Three main areas of concern
 - Schedule (Computer)
 - User interaction (Human)
 - Display (Optional)
- Interfaces
 - Indicate data read
 - User and Schedule and Display
 - AMAN creating schedules
 - User interrupts AMAN





Specification structure - Sub Problems

- Missing details
 - Create a sub problem frame
 - Aircraft kept abstract
 - Time is complex





Specification structure - Sub Problems

- Missing details
 - Create a sub problem frame
 - Aircraft kept abstract
 - Time is complex

- Interaction between them
 - Schedule manipulates Time and Aircraft





Deriving a refinement structure

- 1. Domains sharing interfaces will refine each other eventually
- 2. The first domain implemented might be the one with most incoming interfaces
- 3. Global validation vs. local validation
- 4. Multiple domains sharing interfaces will refine each other vertically
- 5. Domains not connected to the main goal ar secondary





Implementing the specification

- Using VOs
 - One requirement
 - Tasks that show the requirement
 - Applied to one specification

- Every requirement one VO
 - Traces requirement to specification
 - Measurement of completeness
 - Maintenance requirement





VDD implementation cycle





Example

• REQ1: Planes can be added to the flight sequence, e.g., planes arriving in close range of the airport.



Example

• REQ1: Planes can be added to the flight sequence, e.g., planes arriving in close range of the airport.

 $\begin{array}{l} \texttt{REQ1/M0}:\texttt{GF}(\texttt{BA}(\texttt{scheduledAirplanes}\neq\texttt{scheduledAirplanes}\texttt{0})) \implies\\ \texttt{GF}(\texttt{BA}(\{\exists x.(x\in\texttt{scheduledAirplanes}\wedge x\notin\texttt{scheduledAirplanes}\texttt{0})\})) \end{array}$



Example





• REQ5: The space between two aircraft is always =< 3, with 3 being the time in minutes.



 REQ5: The space between two aircraft is always =< 3, with 3 being the time in minutes.

```
\begin{array}{l} \texttt{REQ5/M1}: \forall \texttt{a1}, \texttt{a2} \cdot \texttt{a1} \in \texttt{dom}(\texttt{landing\_sequence}) \land \\ \texttt{a2} \in \texttt{dom}(\texttt{landing\_sequence}) \land \texttt{a1} \neq \texttt{a2} \implies \\ (\texttt{DIST}(\texttt{landing\_sequence}(\texttt{a1}) \mapsto \texttt{landing\_sequence}(\texttt{a2})) \\ \geq \texttt{AIRCRAFT\_SEPARATION\_MIN}) \end{array}
```



• REQ5: The space between two aircraft is always =< 3, with 3 being the time in minutes.

```
\begin{split} \texttt{REQ5/M1} : &\forall \texttt{a1}, \texttt{a2} \cdot \texttt{a1} \in \texttt{dom}(\texttt{landing\_sequence}) \land \\ \texttt{a2} \in \texttt{dom}(\texttt{landing\_sequence}) \land \texttt{a1} \neq \texttt{a2} \implies \\ & (\texttt{DIST}(\texttt{landing\_sequence}(\texttt{a1}) \mapsto \texttt{landing\_sequence}(\texttt{a2})) \\ & \geq \texttt{AIRCRAFT\_SEPARATION\_MIN}) \end{split}
```

```
machine M1 Landing Sequence refines M0 AMAN Update sees M1 Landing Sequence Ctx
 3 variables landing sequence
 6 invariants
    @inv1,1 landing sequence E AIRPLANES + PLANNING_INTERVAL
    @inv13,2 ∀a1,a2 · a1 ∈ dom(landing sequence) ∧
               a2 \in dom(landing sequence) \land a1 \neq a2 \Rightarrow
              (DIST(landing sequence(a1) → landing sequence(a2))
10
11
              ≥ AIRCRAFT SEPARATION MIN)
    @glue1,1 scheduledAirplanes = dom(landing sequence)
13
14 events
    event INITIALISATION
16
       then
17
         @act1,1 landing sequence = ø
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
    end
    event AMAN Update refines AMAN Update
      any new landing sequence
       where
         @grd1,1 new landing sequence ∈ AIRPLANES + PLANNING INTERVAL
         @inv1,2 ∀a1,a2 · a1 ∈ dom(new landing sequence) ∧
                   a2 \in dom(new landing sequence) \land a1 \neq a2 \Rightarrow
                  (DIST(new landing sequence(a1) → new landing sequence(a2))
                  ≥ AIRCRAFT SEPARATION MIN)
       with
         @wit1,1 newScheduledAirplanes = dom(new landing sequence)
       then
         @act1,1 landing sequence = new landing sequence
    end
33 end
```





Conclusion

- VDD
 - Structuring the creation of validatable specifications
 - Structured specification
 - Structured development
 - Focus on validatable specification
- Problem frames
 - Structure refinement
 - Communicate specification structure
- VOs
 - Coverage, Maintenance, Traceability

