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Cleanroom classification and goals

- Proposed by Harlan D. Mills, IBM, since 1980
  - 'Cleanroom' stands for defect prevention instead of defect elimination

Goal:
- High, quantified reliability at low cost

Classification:
- Cleanroom is a development approach
- and a management approach

Context:
- Whenever precise specifications can be written early
  - For new development, maintenance, and reengineering
  - Independent of language and technology
- Requires approximately CMM Level 3
Cleanroom principles

Cleanroom development principle:
• Development teams strive to produce products without any defects
  • by careful design and development
  • by verification and review
  • but not by testing

Cleanroom testing principle:
• The purpose of testing is measuring the reliability of the product
  • not improving the reliability

Cleanroom management principle:
• Team-based practices limit the scope of human fallability and allow for continuous improvement
Empirical results: IBM Cobol SF


- Project developing "Cobol Structuring Facility" COBOL/SF
  - A program analyzer/translator (written in PL/1) for converting Cobol code with GOTOs into structured Cobol code
  - 52 KLOC modified/added to existing 40 KLOC base product

- Overall productivity: +400%
- Overall defect density: 3.4 defects/KLOC
- Field-testing defects: 10 (only 1 of them major)

- The defect reduction is the main reason for the huge improvement in productivity
  - Testing such a system is very laborious
Empirical results: Ellemtel/Ericsson OS32

- L.G. Tann: "OS32 and Cleanroom"
  - *1st Annual European Industrial Symposium on Cleanroom Software Engineering, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1993, pp. 1-40.*

- Project developing an operating system for telephone switching systems
  - 73 people staff, 33 months duration
  - 350 KLOC resulting software size (14 LOC/PM)

- Development productivity: +70%
- Testing productivity: +100% (tests per hour)
- Testing defect density: 1 defect/KLOC

- These are very big improvements, considering this was a mature development organization already.
Empirical results: Controlled experiment

  - IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, 13(9), Sept. 1987
- A controlled experiment:
  15 teams (10 Cleanroom, 5 conventional) of 3 student developers (w. prof. experience). Each develops the same SW
  - electronic messaging system: duration 6 weeks, 4 milestones,
  - resulting size 800 to 2300 LOC of Simple-T code
- Results:
  - The Cleanroom teams developed more functionality
  - All Cleanroom teams kept all milestones, only 2 of the 5 others did
  - The Cleanroom programs were less complex (control flow) and had better annotation
  - The Cleanroom programs had significantly fewer test failures
  - 86% of the developers missed testing (quality was not affected)
Typical Cleanroom techniques

Small teams
- High motivation, close cooperation, efficiency
  - "Defects are not acceptable!"
- Parallel development
  - Strict modularization has to be done at specification time
- Exact specification
  - All partial specifications are precise and self-contained

Strict separation of development and testing
- Development teams
  - Development teams are strictly forbidden to perform any testing
- Test teams
  - Test teams never modify programs
Typical Cleanroom techniques (2)

Exact specification

• Defect prevention
  • Precise specifications help avoid ambiguity defects

• Verification
  • During development, defects are continually searched for by comparing with specification

• Z, VDM, box method, special grammars

Stepwise refinement

• Specification (black box)
  • Describes WHAT without HOW

• State description (state box)
  • Specification as a state machine (not always useful)

• Process description (clear box)
  • Partial HOW: "Implementation", but may use further black boxes
Typical Cleanroom techniques (3)

Review/verification
- Performed for each refinement
  - State box and clear box
- Grounded in mathematics
  - Convincing argumentation, rarely formal mathematical proof
- Argument is formulated and verified during an inspection

Incremental development
- Initially, only basic functionality is developed

Statistical testing
- Usage modelling
  - Test cases are a random sample according to usage model
- Quantitative statement on reliability (certification)
Typical Cleanroom techniques: Note

- First and foremost, Cleanroom development is an attitude
  - So none of the above techniques is absolutely mandatory:

They can be driven to extremes
- for instance developers may be prohibited to even compile their code

They can be relaxed
- for instance by performing defect testing before statistical testing

They can be exchanged for others
- for instance by driving development in some other way than by box refinement
Cleanroom process flow overview
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Problems and Obstacles

Cleanroom is not suited if

- ...formal specification is difficult
  - which is commonly the case for interactive systems
- ...determining the correctness of test outputs is costly
  - but this is a problem for conventional development as well.
  - One could still do Cleanroom without reliability certification
    - leave out statistical testing

Necessary preconditions:

- Highly trained software engineers
  - Others cannot create reliable verification arguments
- Defined software process (CMM Level 2/3)
  - Immature processes will lack the necessary discipline and control
Specification and design with box structure

- Define black box:
  - define output based on input history

- Define state box [perhaps):
  - define states for the representation of input history
  - reformulate black box (may introduce several new black boxes)
  - verify reformulation: state box must be equivalent to black box

- Define clear box:
  - define data abstraction for state data
  - reformulate state box
    (may introduce several new black boxes)
  - verify reformulation:
    clear box must be equivalent to state box

Continue with black boxes of the refinement
Trivial refinement example

- **black box 1: triangleType(a, b, c)**

*precondition:* a, b, c are positive, real numbers

*postcondition:*

return EQUILATERAL / ISOSCELES / OTHER / NO_TRIANGLE

⇔

the triple (a, b, c) is side lengths of an equilateral / non equilateral isosceles / non isosceles triangle / cannot be side lengths of a triangle

(only the lengths of the sides are relevant here!)
Refinement example (2)

• *clear box 1: triangleType(a, b, c)*
  IF allSidesSatisfyTriangleInequation(a, b, c)
  THEN return trueTriangleType(a, b, c)
  ELSE return NO_TRIANGLE

• *black box 2: allSidesSatisfyTriangleInequation(a, b, c)*
  precondition: a, b, c positive, real numbers
  postcondition: True if each side is shorter than the sum of the other two; else False

• *black box 3: trueTriangleType(a, b, c)*
  precondition: (a, b, c) are the side lengths of a triangle
  postcondition: ...
Refinement example (3)

- **verification clear box 1:**
  (a, b, c) can form triangle ⇔
  the two shorter sides x, y together are longer than the longest, z.
  Hence, z < x + y (i.e., "side z satisfies triangle inequation")
  is sufficient for diagnosing a triangle.
  "All sides satisfy triangle inequation" is a stronger condition,
  hence also sufficient.
  Hence, clear box 1 is correct.

(Note: The argument is simplified. It does not cover the necessity of the conditions.)
Refinement example (4)

- **clear box 2**: `allSidesSatisfyTriangleInequation(a, b, c)`
  return \(a < b + c \ \text{AND} \ \ b < a + c \ \text{AND} \ \ c < a + b\)

- **verification clear box 2**: 
  3 different side lengths \(a, b, c\) are tested (\(\rightarrow\) "triangle"),
  tests are connected by 'AND' (\(\rightarrow\) "all sides"),
  each test compares one side to the sum of the two others,
  each comparison is by 'less than' (\(\rightarrow\) correct inequation).
  Hence, the implementation appears to be correct
Refinement example (5)

- clear box 3: `trueTriangleType(a, b, c)`
  
  IF \(a = b = c\) THEN return EQUILATERAL
  ELSE IF \(a = b\) OR \(a = c\) OR \(b = c\) THEN return ISOSCELES
  ELSE return OTHER

- verification clear box 3:
  'Equilateral' is a special case of 'isosceles' and must therefore be tested first, this is done here. The test for 'equilateral' is correct.
  The test for 'isosceles' must check 3 different pairs (correct), only one needs to be equal (connection with 'OR', correct)
  'Other' is the only remaining case, must be 'ELSE' part. Correct.
  Therefore clear box 3 is correct.
Statistical Testing and Certification

- Most software processes use defect testing
  - Goal: Find as many defects as possible, with as few test cases as possible
  - Testing concentrates on 'difficult' cases.
- Defect testing makes almost no statement about reliability.

- In contrast, Cleanroom uses statistical testing
  - Goal: Quantify reliability, somewhat like acceptance testing
  - Does not specifically aim to find defects
  - Testing reflects typical frequencies of typical cases

- Basis: Usage modelling
  - Based on description of the usage profile (from requirements)
  - Mathematical description with Markov-chains (finite state space, discrete events)
Example: Excerpt from the usage model for a text editor

Probabilistic state machine: States are actions, stochastic sequencing
Testing process

- Any number of test inputs can be generated automatically
  - based on the usage model

- Output correctness predicate?
  - Depends on application
  - Often only plausibility checking is possible

- Measure the intervals between failures
  - Terminate when sufficient reliability can be certified
  - Stop when insufficient reliability has been determined
Reliability certification

- The goal is a statement such as "MTTF(program) ≥ m with confidence K"
  - e.g. "With confidence 95% we can say that this program fails at most once every 2 000 000 steps"
  - MTTF: mean time-to-failure

- Computed with statistical methods (binomial distribution)

- Problem:
  When I find and correct a defect, may I still use the data from the previous test runs?
  - Defect models and reliability models may allow this,
  - but then need to rely on assumptions (in particular the non-introduction of new failures).
  - This is beyond the scope of this lecture.
Certification testing: basic idea

Schematic view!  Details follow

Note that the up-steps are not vertical; they go 1 to the right as well.
Details: Binomial distribution

- Given an event (here: failure) with probability $p$ (here: 0.001)
  - i.e. we want to certify 99.9% reliability ($= 1-p$)
- A binomial distribution describes the number $F$ of failures to be expected during $N$ runs (here: $N=3000$)

![Graph showing binomial distribution](http://mathworld.wolfram.com/BinomialDistribution.html)
Certification testing

- Limit lines for binomial distribution (N trials, p=0.001)

$$P_{N,p}(F < y) \geq 0.95$$

continue testing

$$P_{N,p}(F < y) \leq 0.05$$
Cleanroom and CMMI

- CMMI process areas covered by typical Cleanroom practices

- Level 2: Managed
  - Measurement and Analysis MA
    - with respect to reliability only
  - Process and Product Quality Assurance PPQA
    - verification discipline

- Level 3: Defined
  - Technical Solution TS
    - SP 2.3 Design Interfaces Using Criteria: formal specification
  - Verification VER
    - The heart of Cleanroom!

- Level 4: Quantitatively Manag'd
  - Quantitative Project Mgmt QPM
    - Statistical testing

- Level 5: Optimizing
Cleanroom and CMMI (2)

• Cleanroom alone does not get you anywhere wrt. CMMI
  • not even to Level 2

• But the quality culture inspired by Cleanroom was found a useful driver for many improvements up to Level 5:
  • Level 2: PPQA (developers become process-quality-aware);
  • Level 3: VER (reviews become standard practice)
  • Level 4: OPP (defect densities become a natural process benchmark)
  • Level 4: QPM (quantitative quality management is established)
  • Level 5: OID (developers start continuous improvements wrt. defect avoidance, thus opening the organization for process improvement)
Summary:
Cleanroom Software Engineering

- Do not accept defects, favor defect prevention over detection
- Exact specification
- Stepwise refinement with box-specification
- Verification during inspection
- Statistical testing based on usage model
- Reliability certification
- Result: very low defect rate, high productivity
Thank you!