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Model Car Industry: Variety of an BMW X3

- Roof interior: 90000 variants available
- Car door: 3000 variants available
- Rear axle: 324 variants available

“Variante sind ein wesentlicher Hebel für das Unternehmensergebnis”
Franz Decker (BMW Group)

---

Model Car Industry: Variety Increase

- In the 1980s: little variety
  - Option to choose series and maybe a few extras (tape deck, roof rack)
  - A single variant (Audi 80, 1.3l, 55 PS) accounted for 40 percent of Audi’s total revenue

- Twenty years later: built-to-order
  - Audi: $10^{20}$ possible variants
  - BMW: $10^{22}$ possible variants
  - At average there are 1.1 equal instances of an Audi A8 on the street

- Product lines with fully automated assembly

---

33 optional, independent features

one individual variant for each human being
**Challenges**

1. How to **identify** the actually desired variability?
2. How to **express** the intended variability?
3. How to **implement** this variability in the code?
4. How to **map** variability options to the code?
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**Definition: (Software) Product Line, Feature**

**Product Line (Withey) (Definition 1)**

“A product line is a group of products sharing a common, managed set of features that satisfy the specific needs of a selected market.”


**Software Product Line (SEI) (Definition 2)**

“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.”


Remarkable:
SPLs are not motivated by technical similarity of the products, but by feature similarity wrt a certain market

**The Emperors New Clothes?**

**Program Family (Definition 4)**

“Program families are defined [...] as sets of programs whose common properties are so extensive that it is advantageous to study the common properties of the programs before analyzing individual members.”


- Most research on operating-system families from the ’70s would today qualify as work on software product lines [2, 4, 5, 9–11]
- Program Family ⇔ Software Product Line
- However, according to the definitions, the viewpoint is different
  - Program family: defined by similarity between programs ⇔ Solutions
  - SPL: defined by similarity between requirements ⇔ Problems
  - A program family implements a software product line
- In current literature, however, both terms are used synonymously
  - Program Family ⇔ Software Product Line

**SPL Development Reference Process** [1]

- Domain Analysis
- Domain Design
- Domain Implementation

- Application Analysis
- Application Design
- Application Implementation

application engineering ↦→ tailoring
Our understanding: Configurable System Software

Configurability (Definition 5)

Configurability is the property that denotes the degree of pre-defined variability and granularity offered by a piece of system software via an explicit configuration interface.

- Common configuration interfaces
  - Text-based: configure script or configure.h file (GNU tools)
    - configuration by commenting/uncommenting of (preprocessor) flags
    - no validation, no explicit notion of feature dependencies
  - Tool-based: KConfig (Linux, busybox, CiAO, ...), ecosConfig (eCos)
    - configuration by an interactive configuration editor
    - formal model of configuration space, hierarchical features
    - implicit/explicit validation of constraints
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The i4WeatherMon Weather Station

A typical embedded system
- Several, optional sensors
  - Wind
  - Air Pressure
  - Temperature
- Several, optional actuators (here: output devices)
  - LCD
  - PC via RS232
  - PC via USB

To be implemented as a product line
- Barometer: Pressure + Display
- Thermometer: Temperature + Display
- Deluxe: Temperature + Pressure + Display + PC-Connection
- Outdoor: <as above> + Wind
- ...
The i4WeatherMon Software Product Line

Challenges

1. How to **identify** the actually desired variability?
2. How to **express** the intended variability?
3. How to **implement** this variability in the code?
4. How to **map** variability options to the code?

Domain Analysis

- **Problem Space**
  - Domain Expert
  - Features and Dependencies
  - Domain Model
  - Architecture and Implementation

- **Solution Space**
  - Architect / Developer
  - Classes

**Domain Scoping**

- Selection and processing of domain knowledge
- Restriction of diversity and variety

**Domain Modelling**

- Systematic evaluation of the gained knowledge
- Development of a taxonomy

---

*A domain model is an explicit representation of the common and the variable properties of the system in a domain, the semantics of the properties and domain concepts, and the dependencies between the variable properties.*

Elements of the Domain Model

- **Domain definition** specifies the scope of the domain
  - Examples and counter examples
  - Rules for inclusion/exclusion of systems or features
- **Domain glossary** defines the vocabulary of the domain
  - Naming of features and concepts
- **Concept models** describe relevant concepts of the domain
  - Formal description (e.g., by UML diagrams)
  - Textual description
  - Syntax and semantics
- **Feature models** describe the common and variable properties of domain members
  - Textual description
  - Feature diagrams

I4WeatherMon: Domain Model (simplified)

**Domain Definition: i4WeatherMon**

- The domain contains software for the depicted modular hardware platform. Future version should also support new sensor and actuator types (humidity, alarm, ...).
- The externally described application scenarios thermometer, PC, outdoor,... shall be supported.
- The i4WeatherMon controller software is shipped in the flash memory of the µC and shall not be changed after delivery.
- The i4WeatherMon shall be usable with all versions of the PC Weather client software.

**Domain Glossary: i4WeatherMon**

- **PC Connection**: Optional communication channel to an external PC for the sake of continuous transmission of weather data. Internally also used for debug purposes.
- **Sensor**: Part (1 or more) of the i4WeatherMon hardware that measures a particular weather parameter (such as: temperature or air pressure).
- **Actuator**: Part (1 or more) of the i4WeaterMon hardware that processes weather data (such as: LCD).
- **XML Protocol**: XML-based data scheme for the transmission of arbitrary weather data over a PC Connection.
- **SNG Protocol**: Binary legacy data scheme for the transmission of wind, temperature and air pressure data only over a PC Connection as follows:

```xml
<!ELEMENT weather (...)> ...
```
- **PC Connection** ...

**Concept Models: i4WeatherMon**

- **XML Protocol**: The following DTD specifies the format used for data transmission over a PC Connection:

```xml
<!ELEMENT weather (...)> ...
```
- **SNG Protocol**: Wind, temperature and air pressure data are encoded into 4 bytes, sequentially transmitted as a 3-byte datagram over a PC Connection as follows:

```
...
```
- **PC Connection** ...

...
**Challenges**

- **How to identify** the actually desired variability?
- **How to implement** this variability in the code?
- **How to express** the intended variability?
- **How to map** variability options to the code?

**Feature Models**

- **Describe system variants by their commonalities and differences**
  - Specify configurability in terms of optional and mandatory features
  - Intentional construct, independent from actual implementation
- **Primary element is the Feature Diagram:**
  - **Concept (Root)**
  - **Features**
  - **Constraints**

Complemented by textual descriptions
- Definition and rationale of each feature
- Additional constraints, binding times, ...

**Feature Diagrams – Language**

**Syntactical Elements**

The filled dot • indicates a mandatory feature: \( V = \{(C, f_1, f_2)\} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(a) Mandatory features ( f_1 ) and ( f_2 ) have to be included if their parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(b) Optional features ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) can be included if their parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(c) Mandatory feature ( f_1 ) can be included if ( f_2 ) is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(d) Exactly one alternative feature ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) has to be included if their group's parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(e) At least one cumulative feature ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) has to be included if their group's parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(f) Not used. Equivalent to (a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(g) At most one cumulative feature ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) can be included if their group's parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(h) Not used. Equivalent to (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(i) Not used. Equivalent to (h).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Syntactical Elements**

A shallow dot o indicates an optional feature:

- \( V = \{(C, f_1), (C, f_2), (C, f_1, f_2)\} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(b) Optional features ( f_1 ), ( f_2 ) can be included if their parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(c) Mandatory feature ( f_1 ) can be included if ( f_2 ) is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(d) Exactly one alternative feature ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) has to be included if their group's parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(e) At most one alternative feature ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) can be included if their group's parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(f) Not used. Equivalent to (a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(g) At least one cumulative feature ( f_1 ) or ( f_2 ) has to be included if their group's parent feature ( C ) is selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(h) Not used. Equivalent to (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>(i) Not used. Equivalent to (h).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntactical Elements

Feature Diagrams – Language

Of course, both can be combined: 

\[ V = \{(C,f_1),(C,f_1,f_2)\} \]

(c) Mandatory feature \( f_1 \) has to be included, optional feature \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

The shallow arc \( \triangle \) depicts a group of alternative features: 

\[ V = \{(C,f_1),(C,f_2)\} \]

(f) Not used. Equivalent to (e).

Syntactical Elements

The filled arc \( \bullet \) depicts a group of cumulative features: 

\[ V = \{(C,f_1),(C,f_2),(C,f_1,f_2)\} \]

(g) At least one cumulative feature \( f_1,f_2 \) has to be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

Feature Diagrams – Language

(a) Mandatory feature \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) have to be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(d) Exactly one alternative feature \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) has to be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(b) Optional features \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(e) At most one optional alternative feature \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) can be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(f) Not used. Equivalent to (e).

(h) Not used. Equivalent to (b).

(i) Not used. Equivalent to (b).

Feature Diagrams – Language

(a) Mandatory feature \( f_1 \) has to be included, optional feature \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(b) Optional features \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(c) Mandatory feature \( f_1 \) has to be included, optional feature \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(d) Exactly one alternative feature \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) has to be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(e) At most one optional alternative feature \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) can be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(f) Not used. Equivalent to (e).

(h) Not used. Equivalent to (b).

(i) Not used. Equivalent to (b).

Feature Diagrams – Language

(a) Mandatory feature \( f_1 \) has to be included, optional feature \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(b) Optional features \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(c) Mandatory feature \( f_1 \) has to be included, optional feature \( f_2 \) can be included if their parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(d) Exactly one alternative feature \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) has to be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(e) At most one optional alternative feature \( f_1 \) or \( f_2 \) can be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(f) Not used. Equivalent to (e).

(g) At least one cumulative feature \( f_1,f_2 \) has to be included if the group’s parent feature \( C \) is selected.

(h) Not used. Equivalent to (b).

(i) Not used. Equivalent to (b).
I4WeatherMon: Feature Model

Challenges

1. How to identify the actually desired variability?
2. How to express the intended variability?
3. How to implement this variability in the code?
4. How to map variability options to the code?
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I4WeatherMon: Reference Architecture

Functional decomposition (structure and process):

```c
int main() {
    Weather data;
    Sink sink;

    while(true) {
        // acquire data
        data.measure();

        // process data
        sink.process(data);

        wait();
    }
}
```
Implementation Techniques: Classification

- **Decompositional Approaches**
  - Configuration
  - Variant
  - Text-based filtering (untyped)
  - Preprocessors

- **Compositional Approaches**
  - Configuration
  - Variant
  - Language-based composition mechanisms (typed)
  - OOP, AOP, Templates

- **Generative Approaches**
  - Configuration
  - Variant
  - Metamodel-based generation of components (typed)
  - MDD, C++ TMP, generators

Implementation Techniques: Goals

- **General**
  - Separation of concerns (SoC)
  - Resource thriftiness

- **Operational**
  - Granularity Components should be fine-grained. Each artifact should either be mandatory or dedicated to a single feature only.
  - Economy The use of memory/run-time expensive language features should be avoided as far as possible. Decide and bind as much as possible at generation time.
  - Pluggability Changing the set of optional features should not require modifications in any other part of the implementation. Feature implements should be able to "integrate themselves".
  - Extensibility The same should hold for new optional features, which may be available in a future version of the product line.

Implementation Techniques: The C Preprocessor

- **Decompositional Approaches**
  - Configuration
  - Variant
  - Text-based filtering (untyped)
  - Preprocessors (CPP)

- **Conditional compilation with the C Preprocessor (CPP)** is the standard approach to implement static configurability
  - Simplicity: the CPP "is just there"
  - Economy: CPP-usage does not involve any run-time overhead
  - Prominent especially in the domain of system software (Linux 3.2: 85000 `#ifdef` Blocks → "#ifdef hell")
struct Weather {
    #ifdef cfWM_WIND
    UInt16 _wind; // wind unit
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_PRESSURE
    UInt16 _pressure; // pressure unit
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_TEMPERATURE
    UInt16 _temperature; // temperature unit
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_STACK
    UInt16 _maxstack; // maximum stack size
    #endif
    #endif
};

// initialize the CiAO system
init_sensors() {
    wind_unit(); // wind
    #ifdef cfWM_PRESSURE
    pressure_init(); // pressure
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_TEMPERATURE
    temperature_init(); // temperature
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_STACK
    stack_init(); // stack
    #endif
    #endif
};

// helper functions

// measure the weather data
wind_measure() {
    #ifdef cfWM_WIND
    wind_measure(); // wind
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_PRESSURE
    pressure_measure(); // pressure
    #endif
    #ifdef cfWM_TEMPERATURE
    temperature_measure(); // temperature
    #endif
    #endif
};

// The global weather data
Weather data = {0};

// program for output
const char *name = "CiAO.h"

Serial::send(""/

*I4WeatherMon (CPP): Implementation (Excerpt)*

Sensor integration also crosscuts actuator code, an interaction between optional features!

Sensor integration crosscuts the central data structure, an interaction with a mandatory feature.

*I4WeatherMon (CPP): Evaluation*

**General**
- Separation of concerns (SoC)
- Resource thriftiness

**Operational**
- Granularity
  - Components implement only the functionality of a single feature, but contain integration code for other optional features.
- Economy
  - All features is bound at compile time.
- Pluggability
  - Sensor integration crosscuts main program and actuator implementation.
- Extensibility
  - New actuators require extension of main program.
  - New sensors require extension of main program and existing actuators.

*Sensor (and actuator) integration both crosscut the structure of the main program, an interaction with a mandatory feature.*
Implementation Techniques: OOP

Compositional Approaches
- Language-based composition mechanisms (typed)
- OOP, AOP, Templates

Object-oriented programming languages provide means for loose coupling by generalization and OO design patterns
- Interfaces
  - type substitutability (optional/alternative features)
- Observer-Pattern
  - quantification (cumulative feature groups)
- Implicit code execution by global instance construction
  - self integration (optional features)

I4WeatherMon (OOP): Design (Excerpt)

```
I4WeatherMon (OOP): Design (Excerpt)

«interface» Sensor
measure()
name()
unit()
str_val()
]init()

«interface» Actuator
before_process()
after_process()
process()
]init()

Weather
registerSensor()
measure()
]init()

Sink
registerActuator()
process()
]init()

ChainBase
_next

Wind
id()
measure()
name()
unit()
str_val()
]init()

Pressure
id()
measure()
name()
unit()
str_val()
]init()

Display
#print()
before_process()
process()
]init()

SNGConnection
before_process()
after_process()
process()
]init()

PCConnection
#send()
```

I4WeatherMon (OOP): Evaluation

General
1. Separation of concerns (SoC) ✔
2. Resource thriftiness ?

Operational
3. Granularity ✔
   - Every component is either a base class or implements functionality of a single feature only.
4. Economy ✔
   - Run-time binding and run-time type information is used only where necessary to achieve SoC.
5. Pluggability ✔
   - Sensors and actuators integrate themself by design patterns and global instance construction.
6. Extensibility ✔
   - “Plug & Play” of sensor and actuator implementations.

I4WeatherMon: CPP vs. OOP – Footprint

OOP is way more expensive!
Requires a larger µC for each variant.
I4WeaterMon: CPP vs. OOP – Footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variant</th>
<th>version</th>
<th>text (KB)</th>
<th>data (KB)</th>
<th>bss (KB)</th>
<th>stack (KB)</th>
<th>flash (KB)</th>
<th>RAM (KB)</th>
<th>time (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Pressure, Display</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pressure, Display, AO</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>59.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>3008</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>60.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pressure, Display, OO</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature, Display</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>2416</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2444</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3562</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature, Wind Speed,</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2854</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2894</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>76.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2948</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>76.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>4388</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4636</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>76.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature, Wind Speed,</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>79.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pressure, RS232Line,</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>3262</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>77.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>OO</td>
<td>5008</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5308</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Techniques: Summary

- **CPP**: minimal hardware costs – but no separation of concerns
- **OOP**: separation of concerns – but high hardware costs
- **OOP cost drivers**
  - Late binding of functions (virtual functions)
  - Calls cannot be inlined (~ memory overhead for small methods)
  - Virtual function tables
  - Compiler always generates constructors (for vtable initialization)
  - Dead code elimination less effective
- **Dynamic data structures**
- **Static instance construction**
  - Generation of additional initialization functions
  - Generation of a global constructor table
  - Additional startup-code required

Referenzen


