PHILIPS sense and simplicity

Reliability : Software Engineering Perspective - ISSRE 2009

Ajit Ashok Shenvi Philips - Bangalore Sep 23, 2009

Background

- Software Reliability is an important factor in System Reliability as the contribution of software in products is constantly increasing
- Software Reliability is the probability of failure-free software operation in a specified environment for a specified period of time (or natural units)
- NO ONE uniform theory of software reliability yet. NO ONE widely accepted method of estimating or predicting software reliability yet
- Software by itself does not have a "Constant Failure rate (random failures)", hence defining MTBF for only software is tricky
- The typical bath-tub curve for software would look something like this :



Software Reliability – Contents of this paper

- Theme *Building in* Software Reliability during the development life cycle
- Case study of DVD-Hard disk recorder product
 - definition of Reliability as "Critical to Quality (CTQ)" in terms of Robustness and Interoperability aspects
 - flow down of the CTQs into the lower parameters
 - design-in to achieve the desired reliability from software
- Recommendation of a framework for ensuring and tracking software reliability along the software development life-cycle
 - built around the three dimensions of *Fault-Prevention, Fault-Tolerance and Fault-Detection*
 - process structure of CMMI & Orthogonal defect classification, augmented with FMEA and principles of graceful exit mechanisms, supplemented with "Pondering maturity index" for reliability growth.

Software Reliability – DVD-Hard disk recorder



- For this product, Reliability was defined on the following 2 axes:
 - Robustness (How often does it hang or crash in normal user scenarios)
 - Interoperability (Does it work seamlessly with other devices especially Digital cameras via USB port).

Software Reliability – CTQ-1 : Robustness

- The CTQ of Robustness was quantified as "Number of Hangs/crashes" with target as 0
 - in normal scenarios with typical use cases
 - in certain stressed situations with "concurrent" use cases

The lower level factors or (Xs) that could impact the CTQ (Y) Robustness



Robustness = f(Null pointers, Mem leaks, CPU load, Exceptions, Coding errors)

Targets were set for each of the above parameters.

CONFIDENTIAL

Software Reliability – CTQ-1 : Robustness

- A small Script was developed to find all "Null pointers" in the code stack. These were then eliminated
- Stringent *Limits* set for *memory allocation* of subsystems. This was tracked at every release to ensure that all subsystems are within budget and that there is no overlap of memory space. (Subsystems come from different project teams and external suppliers)
- A script was made to check for implementation of "*default conditions*" for "switch case" statements
- Static analyzer tools such **QAC** was run and the target set was 85% code coverage. Errors and warnings were closed.

Software Reliability – CTQ-1 : Robustness

- From Embedded programming experience, it is known that CPU load > 65% makes the system unstable and unpredictable
- Different combinations of scenario's (stressed conditions) were chosen and CPU load tracked using a tool called CodePerf for every release.



Software Reliability – CTQ-1 : Robustness

- **FMEA** was done to identify failure modes leading to exceptional conditions for new features.
 - Graceful exits and error recovery mechanisms were implemented. For e.g. exit with an error message rather than be in a loop when a nonstandard USB device is connected to the recorder, error recovery when a non standard format disc is played on the device
 - A "concurrency" matrix (shown below) was made that depicted levels of parallel use cases that could be executed by the user. The initial requirements were simplified so that the crash and hang conditions could be reduced.



CONFIDENTIAL

Software Reliability - CTQ-1 : Robustness

- An operational profile of typical user scenarios created and the software run on product with different profiles in a continuous loop for 4-days at elevated temperatures (Duration test)
- The results verified every alternate weeks on every build.



Software Reliability - CTQ-1 : Robustness

 Finally the CTQ of robustness – hangs and crashes were measured on weekly basis to verify the results.



Software Reliability - CTQ-2 : Interoperability



PHILIPS Software Reliability – CTQ-2 : Interoperability



Software Reliability Framework - Elements



Software Reliability framework can be built around the 3 pillars
 Fault Prevention, Fault Tolerance and Fault Detection.

CONFIDENTIAL

Means to ensure Reliability

	Progre	essive					
	Fault Prevention	Fault Tolerance	Fault Detection				
•	 Process Rigor (CMMI) Requirements Management with CTQs defined around Voice of Customer Architecture, design with CTQs as the basis Strict enforcement of Coding guidelines Bidirectional Tracebility Peer and expert Reviews ODC based Defect prevention 	 FMEA Exception Handling Graceful exits Graceful degradation 	 Operational profiles testing Stress tests and accelerated tests Reliability growth with Pondering maturity Index 				

PHILIPS Means to ensure Reliability – Fault Prevention

Defect Prevention Structure built around ODC (Orthogonal Defect Classification).



Means to ensure Reliability – Prevention /Tolerance

 FMEA is an excellent tool to build-in fault tolerance and fault prevention mechanisms in systems based on CTQs and use cases.

Recommendation	ecommendation If your FMEA will have more than 30 components, process steps or product functions, perform FMEA simplification first. See Tab titled "Simplification"										Action Results						
SI No	Module/ Component/ Functionality / Feature	Potential Failure Mode	Failure Effect	S E V	Potential Causes	0 C C	Current Controls	D E T	R P N	Actions Recommended	Resp.	Target Date	Actions Taken	S E V	0 C C	D E T	R P N
Unique identification	Module name, Function, Features, Process Step	What can go wrong?	What is the impact of the failure?	How Severe is the effect to the cusotmer?	What are the causes?	How often does cause or FM occur?	What are the existing controls and procedures (inspection and test) that prevent either the cause or the Failure Mode?	How well can you detect cause or FM?		What are the actions for reducing the occurrance of the Cause, or improving detection?	Who is Responsible for the recommende d action?	What is the target date	What are the completed actions that were taken?				
	TSB																
	TSB Marking	Begin marking is done by the user. End marking is not done .	User loses the whole recording or some part of the recording	6	User did a operation without closing the marking	5	Requirements/Design	2	60	Record till end of program if program information is available or record till the next virtual title or record till 6hrs	Mani	706	Requirement s have been changed to specify these new rules	6	1	3	18
		Marking/Recording lost	User loses the whole		No space on HDD		Requirements/Design			While marking if there is	Mani		Requirement				
	The RPN – Risk priority number is a good indicator of reliability – Higher										12						
the RPN, lower the reliability																	

Means to ensure Reliability – Fault Detection



Software Reliability – Summary

- Reliability in simple terms implies *"failure free operation"*
- Definition of a software failure will vary depending on the kind of product
- It is important to define what "software reliability" means for a particular product based on Voice of the customer
- Using this as CTQ, it can be flowed down into the architecture and design
- Reliability can be ensured by : Fault prevention, Fault tolerance and Fault detection techniques built into the software engineering framework
- Some leading indicators than can help estimate "Reliability"
 - Risk priority number from FMEA
 - PMI value in conjunction with Test coverage
 - Pre-release defect density
 - Mean-time between Crashes and Hangs
 - Process compliance scores from CMMI

References

- Jiantao Pan. 1999. Software Reliability. Carnegie Mellon <u>http://www.ece.cmu.edu/~koopman/des_s99/sw_reliability</u>
- Chillarege, R., Bhandari, I. S., Chaar, J. K., Halliday, M. J., Moebus, D. S., Ray, B. K. & Wong, M., Orthogonal Defect Classification: Concept for In-Process Measurement, IEEE. Transaction on Software Engineering, Vol. 18 No. 11, Nov-92 http://www.chillarege.com/odc/articles/odcconcept/odc.html
- CMMI® for development v1.2. August 2006 Reference : CMU/SEI-2006-R-008 ESC-R-2006-008CMMI Product team <u>http://www.sei.cmu.edu/reports/06tr008.pdf</u>
- Pondering Maturity Index : SPEED, Software Creation Process Philips Consumer Electronics, UAT-0482-3301

