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Pre-Charts (Again)
Example: Vending Machine

- **Positive scenario**: Buy a Softdrink
  (i) Insert one 1 euro coin.
  (ii) Press the ‘softdrink’ button.
  (iii) Get a softdrink.

- **Positive scenario**: Get Change
  (i) Insert one 50 cent and one 1 euro coin.
  (ii) Press the ‘softdrink’ button.
  (iii) Get a softdrink.
  (iv) Get 50 cent change.

- **Negative scenario**: A Drink for Free
  (i) Insert one 1 euro coin.
  (ii) Press the ‘softdrink’ button.
  (iii) Do not insert any more money.
  (iv) Get two softdrinks.
A full LSC $\mathcal{L} = (PC, MC, ac, am, \Theta_\mathcal{L})$ actually consists of

- **pre-chart** $PC = ((\mathcal{L}_P, \preceq_P, \sim_P), I_P, \text{Msg}_P, \text{Cond}_P, \text{LocInv}_P, \Theta_P)$ (poss. empty),
- **main-chart** $MC = ((\mathcal{L}_M, \preceq_M, \sim_M), I_M, \text{Msg}_M, \text{Cond}_M, \text{LocInv}_M, \Theta_M)$,
- **activation condition** $ac \in \Phi(C)$, and **mode** $am \in \{\text{initial}, \text{invariant}\}$,
- **strictness flag** $\text{strict}$, **chart mode** existential ($\Theta_\mathcal{L} = \text{cold}$) or **universal** ($\Theta_\mathcal{L} = \text{hot}$).

**Concrete syntax:**

![Diagram of LSC and user interaction]
A full LSC $\mathcal{L} = (PC, MC, ac, am, \Theta_\mathcal{L})$ actually consists of

- **pre-chart** $PC = ((\mathcal{L}_P, \preceq_P, \sim_P), \mathcal{I}_P, \text{Msg}_P, \text{Cond}_P, \text{LocInv}_P, \Theta_P)$ (poss. empty),
- **main-chart** $MC = ((\mathcal{L}_M, \preceq_M, \sim_M), \mathcal{I}_M, \text{Msg}_M, \text{Cond}_M, \text{LocInv}_M, \Theta_M)$,
- **activation condition** $ac \in \Phi(C)$, and **mode** $am \in \{\text{initial}, \text{invariant}\}$,
- **strictness flag** $\text{strict}$, **chart mode** existential ($\Theta_\mathcal{L} = \text{cold}$) or universal ($\Theta_\mathcal{L} = \text{hot}$).

A set of words $W \subseteq (C \rightarrow B)^\omega$ is accepted by $\mathcal{L}$, denoted by $W \models \mathcal{L}$, if and only if

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$am = \text{initial}$</th>
<th>$am = \text{invariant}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w \in W \exists m \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cdot$</td>
<td>$w \in W \exists k \leq m \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cdot$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w^0 \models ac \land \neg \psi_{\text{exit}}(C_0^P) \land \psi_{\text{prog}}(\emptyset, C_0^P)$</td>
<td>$w^k \models ac \land \neg \psi_{\text{exit}}(C_0^P) \land \psi_{\text{prog}}(\emptyset, C_0^P)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\land w/1, \ldots, w/m \in \text{Lang}(\mathcal{B}(PC))$</td>
<td>$\land w/k + 1, \ldots, w/m \in \text{Lang}(\mathcal{B}(PC))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\land w^{m+1} \models \neg \psi_{\text{exit}}(C_0^P)$</td>
<td>$\land w^{m+1} \models \neg \psi_{\text{exit}}(C_0^P)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\land w^{m+1} \models \psi_{\text{prog}}(\emptyset, C_0^M)$</td>
<td>$\land w^{m+1} \models \psi_{\text{prog}}(\emptyset, C_0^M)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\land w/m + 2 \in \text{Lang}(\mathcal{B}(MC))$</td>
<td>$\land w/m + 2 \in \text{Lang}(\mathcal{B}(MC))$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where $C_0^P$ and $C_0^M$ are the minimal (or **instance heads**) cuts of pre- and main-chart.

\[ w^{m+1} \models \psi_{\text{prog}}(\emptyset, C_0^M) \land w/m + 2 \in \text{Lang}(\mathcal{B}(MC)) \]
(i) trivially satisfy ‘buy water’
\[ w = (\text{CSO}), (\text{CSO}?), (\text{pw}!), (\text{pw}?, \text{wis}), \ldots \]
\[ \text{sis} \]

(ii) \[ w = (\text{CSO}), (\text{CSO}!), (\text{E1}!), (\text{E1}?), (\text{pSOFT}!), (\text{pSOFT}?), (\text{pWATER}!), (\text{pWATER}?, \text{wis}), (\text{dSOFT}!), (\text{dSOFT}?, \text{OK}!), (\text{OK}!), (\text{CSO}, \text{ch}!), \ldots \]
\[ \text{ silence} \]

(iii) satisfy chart (non-trivially)
\[ w = (\text{CSO}!), (\text{CSO}!), (\text{pw}!), (\text{pw}?, \text{wis}), (\text{dw}!), (\text{dw}?, \text{OK}!), (\text{OK}!), \ldots \]
\[ \text{ (distinguish: by legal exit in main-chart, or not) } \]
Universal LSC: Example

LSC: buy water
AC: true
AM: invariant I: strict

User -> CoinValidator -> ChoicePanel -> Dispenser

¬(C50! ∨ E1! ∨ pSOFT! ∨ pTEA! ∨ pFILLUP!)

water_in_stock

dWATER

OK

¬(dSoft! ∨ dTEA!)
Requirements Engineering with Scenarios
One quite effective approach:

(i) **Approximate** the software requirements: ask for positive / negative *existential scenarios*.

(ii) **Refine** result into *universal scenarios* (and validate them with customer).

That is:

- Ask the customer to describe *example usages* of the desired system.
  - In the sense of: "If the system is not at all able to do this, then it’s not what I want.”
  - (→ positive use-cases, existential LSC)

- Ask the customer to describe behaviour that **must not happen** in the desired system.
  - In the sense of: "If the system does this, then it’s not what I want.”
  - (→ negative use-cases, LSC with pre-chart and hot-\textit{false})

- Investigate preconditions, side-conditions, exceptional cases and corner-cases.
  - (→ extend use-cases, refine LSCs with conditions or local invariants)

- Generalise into universal requirements, e.g., *universal LSCs*.

- **Validate** with customer using new positive / negative scenarios.
Strengthening Scenarios Into Requirements

Customer → Developer

- Needs!
- Solution!
- Customer announcement (Lastenheft)
- Customer offer (Pflichtenheft)
- Customer software contract (incl. Pflichtenheft)
- Developer software delivery

Customer → Developer

- Needs!
- Needs!
- Needs!
- Needs!
- Needs!
- Ask customer for (pos./neg.) scenarios, note down as existential LSCs:
Strengthening Scenarios Into Requirements

- Ask customer for (pos./neg.) scenarios, note down as existential LSCs:

- Strengthen into requirements, note down as universal LSCs:

- Re-Discuss with customer using example words of the LSCs’ language.
A requirements specification should be

- **correct**
  - it correctly represents the wishes/needs of the customer,
- **complete**
  - all requirements (existing in somebody's head, or a document, or ...) should be present,
- **relevant**
  - things which are not relevant to the project should not be constrained,
- **consistent, free of contradictions**
  - each requirement is compatible with all other requirements; otherwise the requirements are not realisable,
- **neutral, abstract**
  - a requirements specification does not constrain the realisation more than necessary,
- **traceable, comprehensible**
  - the sources of requirements are documented, requirements are uniquely identifiable.
- **testable, objective**
  - the final product can objectively be checked for satisfying a requirement.

**Correctness** and **completeness** are defined relative to something which is usually only in the customer's head.

→ is is difficult to be sure of correctness and completeness.

"Dear customer, please tell me what is in your head!" is in almost all cases **not a solution**!
It's not unusual that even the customer does not precisely know...!
For example, the customer may not be aware of contradictions due to technical limitations.

**Definition.** [LSC Consistency] A set of LSCs \( \{L_1, \ldots, L_n\} \) is called **consistent** if and only if there exists a set of words \( W \) such that \( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} W \models \models_{\text{L}} \).
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Software and Software Specification, formally
**Definition.** Software is a finite description $S$ of a (possibly infinite) set $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ of (finite or infinite) computation paths of the form

$$
\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \cdots
$$

where

- $\sigma_i \in \Sigma, i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is called state (or configuration), and
- $\alpha_i \in A, i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is called action (or event).

The (possibly partial) function $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : S \mapsto \llbracket S \rrbracket$ is called interpretation of $S$. 
Example: Software, formally

Software is a finite description $S$ of a (possibly infinite) set $[[S]]$ of (finite or infinite) computation paths of the form $\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_i$: state/configuration; $\alpha_i$: action/event.

• Java Programs.

1: public int f(int x, int y) {
2:     x = x + y;
3:     y = x / 2;
4:     return y;
5: }

\sigma_0: pc = 1, x = 2, y = 13
\sigma_1: pc = 2, x = 24, y = 13
\sigma_2: pc = 3, x = 30, y = 20
\sigma_3: pc = ...
Software is a finite description $S$ of a (possibly infinite) set $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ of (finite or infinite) computation paths of the form $\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_i$: state/configuration; $\alpha_i$: action/event.

- Java Programs.
- HTML.

```html
1: <html>
2: <head>
3: <title>SWT 2016</title>
4: </head>
5: <body/>
6: </html>
```
Example: Software, formally

**Software** is a finite description $S$ of a (possibly infinite) set $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ of (finite or infinite) computation paths of the form $\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_i$: state/configuration; $\alpha_i$: action/event.

- Java Programs.
- HTML.
- etc. etc.
**Definition.** A **software specification** is a finite description $\mathcal{S}$ of a (possibly infinite) set $[[\mathcal{S}]]$ of softwares, i.e.

$$[[\mathcal{S}]] = \{(S_1, [[\cdot]]_1), \ldots \}.$$ 

The (possibly partial) function $[[\cdot]] : \mathcal{S} \mapsto [[\mathcal{S}]]$ is called **interpretation** of $\mathcal{S}$. 

---

**Software Specification, formally**

Customer Developer **announcement** (Lastenheft) → Customer Developer **offer** (Pflichtenheft) → Customer Developer **software contract** (incl. Pflichtenheft) → Developer **software delivery** 

Needs! → Solution! → Needs!
Example: Software Specification

Alphabet:

- \( M \) – dispense cash only,
- \( C \) – return card only,
- \( M \rightarrow C \) – dispense cash and return card.

- **Customer 1**: “don’t care”

\[ \mathcal{S}_1 = (M.C | C.M | M \rightarrow C)^\omega \]

- **Customer 2**: “you choose, but be consistent”

\[ \mathcal{S}_2 = (M.C)^\omega \text{ or } (C.M)^\omega \]

- **Customer 3**: “consider human errors”

\[ \mathcal{S}_3 = (C.M)^\omega \]
A software specification is a finite description $S$ of a set $[S]$ of softwares $\{(S_1, [\cdot]_1), \ldots \}$.

- **Decision Tables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$: room ventilation</th>
<th>$r_1$</th>
<th>$r_2$</th>
<th>$r_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b$ button pressed?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$off$ ventilation off?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$on$ ventilation on?</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$go$ start ventilation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$stop$ stop ventilation</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{r_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{r_2} \sigma_2 \ldots \\
\text{if } \sigma_i \vdash \text{Pre} (r_i) \\
\text{then } \sigma_{i+1} \vdash \text{Post} (r_i)
\]
A *software specification* is a finite description $\mathcal{S}$ of a set $[[\mathcal{S}]]$ of softwares $\{(S_1, [\cdot]_1), \ldots\}$.

- **Decision Tables.**
- **LSCs.**
More Examples: Software Specification, formally

A software specification is a finite description $\mathcal{S}$ of a set $\llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket$ of softwares $\{(S_1, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_1), \ldots\}$.

- Decision Tables.
- LSCs.
- Global Invariants.

$$x \geq 0$$
More Examples: Software Specification, formally

A **software specification** is a finite description $\mathcal{S}$ of a set $[\mathcal{S}]$ of softwares $\{(S_1, [\cdot]_1), \ldots \}$.

- Decision Tables.
- LSCs.
- Global Invariants.
- State Machines.

→ later
A **software specification** is a finite description $\mathcal{S}$ of a set $[[\mathcal{S}]]$ of softwares $\{(S_1, [\cdot]_1), \ldots\}$.

- Decision Tables.
- LSCs.
- Global Invariants.
- State Machines.
- Java Programs.

```java
public int f( int x, int y ) {
    x = x + y;
    y = x / 2;
    return y;
}
```

$\mathcal{L} = \{(s, c \cdot b)\}$
A software specification is a finite description $\mathcal{S}$ of a set $[\mathcal{S}]$ of softwares $\{(S_1, [\cdot]_1), \ldots \}$. 

- Decision Tables.
- LSCs.
- Global Invariants.
- State Machines.
- Java Programs.
- etc. etc.
The Requirements Engineering Problem Formally

- **Requirements engineering:**
  Describe/specify the set of the allowed softwares as $\mathcal{S}$.
  
  **Note:** what is not constrained is allowed, usually!

- **Software development:**
  Create one software $\mathcal{S}$ whose computation paths $\llbracket S \rrbracket$ are all allowed, i.e. $\llbracket S \rrbracket \in \mathcal{S}$.
  
  **Note:** different programs in different programming languages may describe the same $\llbracket S \rrbracket$.
  
  **Often allowed:** any refinement of (→ in a minute; e.g. allow intermediate transitions).
$\mathcal{J} = \{(S_0, [\cdot]_0)\}$

$(S_1, [\cdot]_1)$

$S_1$ implements $\mathcal{J}$ via $I$ and $M$

$(S_2, [\cdot]_2)$

$S_2$ implements $\mathcal{J}$ via $I'$ and $M'$

$\text{send-down}()$
LSCs vs. Software
A software $S$ is called **compatible** with LSC $\mathcal{L}$ over $C$ and $E$ is if and only if

- $\Sigma = (C \rightarrow \mathbb{B})$, i.e. the **states** are valuations of the conditions in $C$,
- $A \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{!\,?,}$ i.e. the **events** are of the form $E!$, $E?$ (viewed as a valuation of $E!$, $E?$).

A computation path $\pi = \sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \cdots \in \llbracket S \rrbracket$ of software $S$ **induces** the word $w(\pi) = (\sigma_0 \cup \alpha_1), (\sigma_1 \cup \alpha_2), (\sigma_2 \cup \alpha_3), \ldots$, we use $W_S$ to denote the set of words induced by $\llbracket S \rrbracket$.

We say software $S$ **satisfies** LSC $\mathcal{L}$ (without pre-chart), denoted by $S \models \mathcal{L}$, if and only if

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$</th>
<th>$am = \text{initial}$</th>
<th>$am = \text{invariant}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>cold</strong></td>
<td>$\exists w \in W_S \cdot w^0 \models ac \land \neg \psi_{exit}(C_0)$ $\land w^0 \models \psi_{prog}(\emptyset, C_0) \land w/1 \in \text{Lang}(B(\mathcal{L}))$</td>
<td>$\exists w \in W_S \exists k \in \mathbb{N}<em>0 \cdot w^k \models ac \land \neg \psi</em>{exit}(C_0)$ $\land w^k \models \psi_{prog}(\emptyset, C_0) \land w/k + 1 \in \text{Lang}(B(\mathcal{L}))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hot</strong></td>
<td>$\forall w \in W_S \cdot w^0 \models ac \land \neg \psi_{exit}(C_0)$ $\implies w^0 \models \psi_{prog}(\emptyset, C_0) \land w/1 \in \text{Lang}(B(\mathcal{L}))$</td>
<td>$\forall w \in W_S \forall k \in \mathbb{N}<em>0 \cdot w^k \models ac \land \neg \psi</em>{exit}(C_0)$ $\implies w^k \models \psi_{\text{Cond}}^{\text{hot}}(\emptyset, C_0) \land w/k+1 \in \text{Lang}(B(\mathcal{L}))$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Software $S$** satisfies a **set** of LSCs $\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_n$ if and only if $S \models \mathcal{L}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. 
**How to Prove that a Software Satisfies an LSC?**

- Software $S$ satisfies **existential** LSC $\mathcal{L}$ if there exists $\pi \in \llbracket S \rrbracket$ such that $\mathcal{L}$ accepts $w(\pi)$. Prove $S \models \mathcal{L}$ by demonstrating $\pi$.

- Note: **Existential** LSCs* may hint at test-cases for the acceptance test! (*: as well as (positive) scenarios in general, like use-cases)

![Diagram showing the interaction between User and Vendor Manager](image-url)
How to Prove that a Software Satisfies an LSC?

- Software $S$ satisfies existential LSC $\mathcal{L}$ if there exists $\pi \in \llbracket S \rrbracket$ such that $\mathcal{L}$ accepts $w(\pi)$. Prove $S \models \mathcal{L}$ by demonstrating $\pi$.

- Note: Existential LSCs* may hint at test-cases for the acceptance test! (*: as well as (positive) scenarios in general, like use-cases)

- Universal LSCs (and negative/anti-scenarios!) in general need an exhaustive analysis! (Because they require that the software never ever exhibits the unwanted behaviour.) Prove $S \not\models \mathcal{L}$ by demonstrating one $\pi$ such that $w(\pi)$ is not accepted by $\mathcal{L}$.
Pushing It Even Further

(Harel and Marelly, 2003)
Tell Them What You’ve Told Them...

- **Live Sequence Charts** (if well-formed)
  - have an abstract syntax: instance lines, messages, conditions, local invariants; mode: hot or cold.

- From an abstract syntax, mechanically construct its **TBA**.

- **Pre-charts** allow us to
  - specify **anti-scenarios** (“this must not happen”),
  - contrain **activation**.

- An **LSC** is **satisfied** by a software \( S \) if and only if
  - **existential** (cold):
    - there is a word induced by a computation path of \( S \)
    - which is **accepted** by the LSC’s pre/main-chart TBA.
  - **universal** (hot):
    - all words induced by the computation paths of \( S \)
    - are **accepted** by the LSC’s pre/main-chart TBA.

- **Method**:
  - discuss (anti-)scenarios with customer,
  - generalise into universal LSCs and re-validate.
Requirements Engineering Wrap-Up
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**Example: Software Specification**

**Alphabet:**
- $M$ – dispense cash only,
- $C$ – return card only,
- $M/C$ – dispense cash and return card.

**Customer 1:** “don’t care”

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = (M.C | C.M | M/C)$$

**Customer 2:** “you choose, but be consistent”

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = (M.C)^\omega \text{ or } (C.M)^\omega$$

**Customer 3:** “consider human errors”

$$\mathcal{S}_3 = (C.M)^\omega$$
Formal Methods in the Software Development Process

Mmmh, Software!

Customer 2

Requirements

\[ \mathcal{S}_1 = \{(M.C, [\cdot]_1), (C.M, [\cdot]_1)\} \]

Design

\[ \mathcal{S}_2 = \{(M.T.M.C, [\cdot]_1), (C.T.C.M, [\cdot]_1)\} \]

Implementation

\[ \mathcal{S} = \{\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \ldots , \ldots\} \]
A **Requirements Specification** should be
- correct, complete, relevant, consistent,
  neutral, traceable, objective.

**Requirements Representations** should be
- easily understandable, precise,
  easily maintainable, easily usable.

**Languages / Notations** for Requirements Representations:
- Natural Language Patterns
- Decision Tables
- User Stories
- Use Cases
- Live Sequence Charts

**Formal representations**
- can be very **precise**, objective, testable,
- can be **analysed** for, e.g., completeness, consistency
- can be **verified** against a formal design description.

(Formal) inconsistency of, e.g., a decision table
**hints at** inconsistencies in the requirements.
Requirements Analysis in a Nutshell

- Customers **may not know** what they want.
  - That's in general not their “fault”!
  - Care for **tacit** requirements.
  - Care for **non-functional** requirements / constraints.

- For **requirements elicitation**, consider starting with
  - **scenarios** (“positive use case”) and **anti-scenarios** (“negative use case”)
  and elaborate corner cases.
  Thus, **use cases** can be **very useful** – use case **diagrams** not so much.

- Maintain a **dictionary** and high-quality descriptions.

- Care for **objectiveness / testability** early on.
  Ask for each requirements: what is the **acceptance test**?

- **Use formal notations**
  - to **fully understand requirements** (precision),
  - for **requirements analysis** (completeness, etc.),
  - to communicate with your developers.

- If in doubt, **complement** (formal) **diagrams with text**
  (as safety precaution, e.g., in lawsuits).
Literature Recommendation

(Rupp and die SOPHISTen, 2014)
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