



Future-Proof Software-Systems (FPSS)

Part 4A: Architecting for Dependability

Lecture WS 2017/18: Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

1







Remember Our objective is: To build, evolve, and maintain long-lived, mission-critical IT-systems with a strong dependability, an easy changeability, and a high business value.

 $\odot~$ Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18 $\,$



Content

Part 4A:

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Dependability (Repetition)
- 3. Architecting for Dependability
- 4. Dependability Architecture Principles
 - **General** Dependability Architecture Principles (Resilience)

Part 4B:

• **Specific** Dependability Architecture Principles (Examples)



Introduction



Architecting for Changeability: Part 3

Software Changeability

enables success in the competitive business arena

Software Dependability

assures survival in the hostile world

Architecting for Dependability: **Part 4** (this part)





http://www.clipartsheep.com



Example:

Weak bank security (1/2)



February 15, 2015

Carbanak cyber gang:

Hackers in Eastern Europe are bleeding banks dry, stealing as much as **\$1 billion** from more than 100 financial institutions in a string of attacks that borrow heavily from targeted attacks against sensitive government and industrial targets

https://threatpost.com



Example: Weak bank security (2/2)

 \Rightarrow Significant risk for the world banking system

Why is that possible?



Years and years of neglecting dependability!



Example:

Industrial espionage (1/2)



Hackers stole proprietary information from six U.S. and European energy companies, including Exxon Mobil, Royal Dutch Shell, and BP.

Hackers targeted *computerized topographical maps* worth "millions of dollars" that locate potential oil reserves.

The cyberespionage started in 2009 and went on for years (on-going!)

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

9



Example: Industrial espionage (2/2)

 \Rightarrow Significant risk for the industrial development

Why is that possible?



Years and years of neglecting Dependability!



Example:

Infrastructure weakness (1/2)



In 2007, researchers at the Idaho National Lab conducted the Aurora test, in which a *virus* manipulated the computer network systems that controlled *diesel generators*. The controlled test resulted in an out-of-synchronism condition. Specifically, the out-of-phase synchronism or out-of-phase condition which causes them to fail.

This test is significant because it demonstrated the ability for a *computer virus to manipulate grid systems* and cause massive *physical* damage.

https://www.scientificamerican.com



Example: Infrastructure weakness (2/2)

 \Rightarrow Enormous risk for the power infrastructures of Nations

Why is that possible?



Years and years of neglecting Dependability!



Example: IoT [Internet of Things] (1/2)

September 2016: Hackers found 47 new <u>vulnerabilities</u> in 23 IoT devices at DEF CON



The results from this year's IoT hacking contest are in and it's **not a pretty picture**: Smart door locks, padlocks, thermostats, refrigerators, wheelchairs and even solar panel arrays were among the internet-of-things devices that fell to hackers during the IoT Village held at the DEF CON security conference in August 2016.



Example: IoT [Internet of Things] (2/2)

 \Rightarrow Unbelievable risk for our connected work and life

Why is that possible?



After 20 years in the Security Game: Everything old, is new again



Example:

ICE train real-time problem (1/2)



June 2013:

The delivery of the new ICE-Trains from SIEMENS to the Deutsche Bahn is *massively delayed*. <u>Reason</u>: Real-Time performance problems in the train control software. The brake command takes **one second** to travel through the software and start braking. With a full-stop command from 250 km/h the train will stop 70 meters later because of the software latency.

http://www.tagesspiegel.de/wirtschaft/softwareprobleme-ice-bremsen-zu-spaet/7435884.html



Example:

ICE train real-time problem (2/2)





Eisenbahn-Bundesamt

The German train regulator refused to accept the ICE trains

Massive delay and significant monetary losses for both SIEMENS and Deutsche Bahn

Cause:

The dependability criterium «real-time **requirements**» has not been adequately addressed during software development !



Lessons learned:

«Non-functional aspects (Dependability properties) win the game»

- *Functional aspects* are (in most cases) foremost in the stakeholder's views
- *Non-functional aspects* are (in many cases) added as an afterthought
- *Non-functional aspects* are cross-cutting concerns they affect the very **core** of architecture and design
- Implementing/fixing *non-functional aspects* in a later phase especially after deployment is a tremendously expensive and risky endeavour
- Not meeting *the non-functional aspects* is often the death of a product or service (and possibly: of the company)

 $\odot~$ Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18 $\,$



Lessons learned:

Non-functional aspects/properties are a central **responsibility** in all

phases of the software/system development process







The world is a *dangerous place* for software

and is becoming more dangerous every year





Where can we build dependability?

On the side of the disruption?







On the side of the impact?









Where can we build dependability?





We need:

Continuous & consistent *hardening* of the software-systems

In response to:

- New threats & attacks
- Disruptions in the environment
- Faults and errors (internal & external)
- Increased risks
- Raising hostility





Continuous development of **dependability** leads to a sustainable system **(= path to future-proof SW)**





Dependability Evolution Trajectory



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18





Central questions:

- How do we *define* dependability?
- What is **good** dependability?
- Can we *measure* dependability?
- Which *principles* lead to good dependability?



Resilience Example: Security (Entry protection)







Missing: A Security Architecture!



Foundation of a dependable system



\Rightarrow VERTICAL ARCHITECTUREs (= STRUCTURE)

	Future-Proof Software-Systems [Part 4A]					
Elements of the dependability architecture		Security Architecture (Defense)	Safety Architecture (Accidents)	Performance Architecture (Real-Time)	System Management Architecture (Control)	etc.
Functional Architectures	Business Architecture (Business Processes)					
	Applications Architecture (Functionality)					
	Information (Data) Architecture (Information & Data)					
	Integration Architecture (Cooperation Mechanisms)					
	Technical Architecture (Technical Infrastructure)					



[©] Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18



http://www.marinabaysands.com

Dependability Architecture Principles





Dependability Architecture Principles





Textbook



Rob de Bie, Bryan Bakker,Rene van den Eertwegh, Peter Wijnhoven: **Finally... Reliable Software!:** *A practical approach to design for reliability* CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015. ISBN 978-1-4992-2666-9



John Knight: Fundamentals of Dependable Computing for Software Engineers

CRC Press (Francis & Taylor), USA, 2012. ISBN 978-1-439862551



Dependability: Repetition



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18







Dependable System

"Dependability" refers to the user's ability to depend on a system in its intended environment, with its intended use, as well as when these assumptions are violated or external events cause disruptions.



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

DEFINITIONS




Dependability Profile

For every domain or application a *dependability profile* is defined

Application Domain Quality Property	1	2	3	4	5
	(low)				(high)
Functionality				х	
Availability			x <		
Security					X
Safety					x
Integrity				x	
Efficiency		x			
Performance		x			
Reliability			x		
Recoverability		x			
Traceability (& Forensics)	x				
Accountability		x			



Quality Property Score Card



Example: Automotive Domain

#	System Quality Property	Weight 0: irrelevant 10: highest importance				
Primary Characteristics						
1	Business Value	10				
2	Changeability	10				
Dependability:						
3	Safety	9				
4	Fault-Tolerance	9				
5	Compliance to laws & regulations	9				
6	Integrity (Sensor Data)	9				
7	Availability	8				
8	Security	7				
9	Diagnosability	б				
Secondary Characteristics						
10	Resources (Memory, CPU,)	8				
11	Compliance to industry-standards	7				
12	Usability (User Interfaces)	9				
etc						

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DRESDEN		Future-Proof Software-Sys	stems [Part 4A]	
Quality Property Score Card	#	System Quality Property	Weight 0: irrelevant 10: highest importance	
		Primary Characteris		
	1	Business Value	10	
	2	Changeability	10	
	Dep	endability:	Requirements	
	3	Safety	9	Requirements.
	4	Fault-Tolerance	9	
	5	Compliance to laws & regulations	9	
	6	Integrity (Sensor Data)	9	00.000 /0
	7	Availability	8	
Example:	8	Security	7	
Automotive Domain	9	Diagnosability	6	³⁵ [%] 99.9 %
		Secondary Character	99.9999 %	
	10	Resources (Memory, CPU,)	8	
	11	Compliance to industry-standards	7	
	12	Usability (User Interfaces)	9	
	etc			









Architecting for Dependability



Architecting for Dependability:

Defining and implementing an **IT-structure** providing the

optimum defense against incidents,

based on a risk management methodology



Dependability Engineer:

Responsible for the resilience

engineering process in a company

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

DEFINITIONS

































How can we achieve *high dependability* in a technical system? **Risk-based** Adaptive Score-card approach approach approach Specify the domain-Use of a risk-Use self-* capabilities specific management [Autonomic Computing] methodology dependability properties Risk Plan Identify **Assess Risks** Self-Self-Hazards Healing Configuring Evaluate Review Control Self-Self-Implement Optimizing Protecting Monitor

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18



\Rightarrow Dependability Engineering



... an interesting research & applications field







Resílíence









Resilience (from the definition):

- *Before* Allows anticipation and corrective action to be considered
- *During* How the system survives the impact of the disruption
- After How the system recovers from the disruption

. . .

Mode(s) of operation (Forensic) Analysis Diagnosis Repair procedures Improvements ... Operating procedures Monitoring Logging/Audit trail Recovery mechanisms Resiliency objectives (Profile) Risk & hazard analysis Resilient architecture Full planning Careful Engineering Safe development (Process) Recovery procedures Scenario testing



The four cornerstones of resilience



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

t



Resilience Patterns





General (Overarching) Architecture Principles for Resilience

- R1: Policies
- R2: Vertical Architectures
- R3: Fault Containment Regions
- R4: Single Points of Failure
- R5: Multiple Lines of Defense
- R6: Fail-Safe States
- R7: Graceful Degradation
- R8: Dependable Foundation (Infrastructure)
- R9: Monitoring



General Resílíence

Architecture Principles





http://www.differencebetween.info



Policy:

The set of *basic principles* and *associated guidelines*, formulated and enforced by the governing body of an organization, to direct and limit its actions in pursuit of *long-term goals*

http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/policy.html

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

DEFINITIONS





Defines the targets, direction and restraints of all activities of the organization







Good policies guide the course of a company in all relevant areas towards sustainable success

Good policies are a great help for the people implementing company objectives, especially *infrastructure projects*





Example:

ISO27001

Information Security

Framework

http://www.iso.org/iso/iso27001





Example:

CC – Common Criteria

Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CC), and the companion Common **Methodology** for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CEM)

https://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/files/ccfiles/CEMV3.1R4.pdf



An Introduction



Resilience Architecture Principle R1:

Policies

- 1. Develop and enforce good, comprehensive, consistent policies for the infrastructure of the company or organization
- 2. Support the policies by carefully selected standards, methodologies and frameworks
 - 3. Keep all policies and supporting material up-to-date and adapted to the changing environment
- 4. Consequently apply the policies to the evolution of the infrastructure (enforcement)

Justification: Technical infrastructure has become so complex and important that it needs to be governed by a consistent set of policies – otherwise the resulting divergence is a massive risk for the company



Auroop Ratan Ganguly, Stephen E. Flynn, Udit Critical Infrastructures Resilience: Policy and

Productivity Press, 2018. ISBN 978-1-4987-5863-5

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

Textbook



General Resílíence

Architecture Principles












Cell X

= Safety Concern in the Application Software

Architecture Framework Cells =

Allow assignment, structuring, and separating of the functionality and of the quality properties of IT-systems to enable partitioning and life-cycle management.

 \Rightarrow Formulation of Powerful Set of Architecture Principles,

<u>e.g.:</u>

NEVER implement security functionality in the applications software

... but only allow calls to the security functionality

«Canon of Orthogonality»











Consistency of Vertical Architectures





Example: Authentication/Authorization Architecture (Security)







The quality and consistency of the vertical architectures determines the **dependability** of the system

However, ... this represents a large amount of very difficult work









Resilience Architecture Principle R2:

Vertical Architectures

1. The dependability of the system is directly dependent on the quality of the vertical architectures (and the quality of their implementation)

- 2. Match the quality of the vertical architectures to the risk/damage potential of your application (Caution: be on the safe side)
 - 3. Continuously maintain/evolve your vertical architectures in sync with changing environments and requirements

Justification: Vertical architectures are at the core of dependability. A great bandwith in quality of vertical architectures exists. If the quality is too low, your systems/applications may be at risk.



Textbook



Jan Killmeyer: Information Security Architecture: An Integrated Approach To Security in The Organization

Auerbach Publishers Inc., USA, 2nd edition 2006. ISBN 978-0-849-31549-7



Systems

Syngress Media, USA, 2016. ISBN 978-0-128-03773-7



General Resílíence

Architecture Principles





© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18









The consequences of a *fault* – the ensuing *error* – can **propagate** either by an erroneous message or by an erroneous output action of the faulty part





Fault propagation can consecutively affect system parts (\Rightarrow Domino effect)

The result may be severe malfunctions or the loss of the system

Fault propagation is difficult to predict





Build **error** propagation boundaries around each system part

 $\odot~$ Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18 $\,$



Fault tolerant systems are often built around the concept of *fault containment regions* (FCRs).

The primary goal of a FCR is to limit the effects of a fault and *prevent the propagation* of errors from one region of the system to another.

A FCR is a subsystem that will operate correctly regardless of any arbitrary fault outside the region.

FCRs may be physically separated, electrically isolated, and have independent power supplies.







Typology of Failures:

- *Temporal* domain (too early, too late, not at all)
- Value domain (incorrect or out of range values)
- Content domain (wrong, faked or unallowed content)

DEFINITIONS



Failure Detection



A failure can only be detected:

- If the *observed* behaviour of a component can be judged in relation to the *intended* behaviour
- If the system contains some form of *redundant* information about the intended behaviour



Failure Handling





Failure Handling





Example: Car ABS (1/2)







Constructing Fault Containment:







Туре	Detection	Failure Handling	Required Info
Temporal fault (too early, too late, not at all)	Timing frame (global clock) & timing model	Repeat (N x) Redundancy Fail safe state	Time reference
Value fault (incorrect or out of range values)	Interface contract violation	Repeat (N x) Algorithms Fail safe state	Formal contract
Content fault (wrong, faked or unallowed content)	Integrity protection (e.g. # certs)	Repeat request Redundancy Fail safe state	Model



Constructing Fault Containment:





Example: *Temporal* Failures (Time-Triggered Architecture **TTA**)



The messages are transported in exactly defined and assigned time slots, based on precise clock synchronization in all nodes



Resilience Architecture Principle R3:

Fault Containment Regions

1. Partition the system into fault containment regions

2. Build error propagation boundaries around each system part (\Rightarrow Interfaces)

3. Provide sufficient redundant information about the intended behavior of the system parts (components)

Justification: A fault or incident causing an error or disruption in one part (component) of the system should not propagate to other parts of the system and thus cause a sequence of errors and failures





General Resílíence

Architecture Principles









A single point of failure (SPOF) is a part of a system that, if it *fails*, will stop the *entire* system from working


Example: Computer Network









Single Points of Failure (SPOF) are a high risk for dependabillity



Single Points of Failure (SPOF)

may be well hidden in a system

and sometimes difficult to find

Single Points of Failure (SPOF) are <u>eliminated</u> by:

a) Intelligent architecture/design

b) Introduction of *redundancy*



Example: Computer Network



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18



2. Eliminate single points of failure, e.g. by introducing redundancy

Justification: Any single point of failure is a great risk for a dependable system. They must therefore be avoided







General Resílíence

Architecture Principles





Multiple lines of defense represents the use of *multiple* computer techniques to help mitigate the risk of one component of the defense being compromised or circumvented



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

DEFINITIONS



Example: South-East Louisiana Coast Hurricane Flood Protection





Multiple Lines of Defense Strategy









R5

Resilience Architecture Principle R5:

Multiple Lines of Defense

1. For each threat and incident implement multiple, independent lines of defense

2. For each line of defense use different methods, techniques and technologies

Justification: If a line of defense is overcome as a consequence of an incident, the second (third, ...) line of defense may mitigate the impact of the incident



Textbook



Klaus Schmidt: **High Availability and Disaster Recovery:** *Concepts, Design, Implementation*

Springer-Verlag, Germany, 2006. ISBN 978-3-540-24460-8



Zachary Taylor, Subramanyam Ranganathan: Designing High Availability Systems: DFSS and Classical Reliability Techniques with Practical Real Life Examples

Wiley-IEEE Press, USA, 2013. ISBN 978-1-118-55112-7



General Resílíence

Architecture Principles







Fail-safe means that a system will not endanger lives or property when it fails.

It will go into a *fail-safe state* and stop working.

DEFINITION

A fail-safe system does not mean that failure is impossible or improbable – but that the system's design and implementation prevent **unsafe consequences** of the failure



"As engineers we sometimes find designing equipment to be well-built is much easier than designing it to fail predictably"

Peter Herena, 2011



Fail-safe means that a system will not endanger lives or property when it **fails**





The operation of the system is a sequence of states. A state change is triggered by an event.



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

126



Safe State



STOP while avoiding an accident \Rightarrow Human intervention





NO safe state necessary (uncritical)

Safe-states only for subsystems Revert to human intervention



NO safe state (critical)



<u>Safe State</u> – Example 1: Train Signalling System (1/2)



A train signalling system controls the lights and switches to assure an accident-free train traffic



Safe State – Example 1: Train Signalling System (2/2)





Safe Which is the safe state for this system? *State*





<u>Safe State</u> – Example 2: Transaction Rollback (1/2)



© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

State



Safe State – Example 2: Transaction Rollback (2/2)









R6



Fail-Safe States

- 1. Execute a careful hazard analysis of your *full system* to identify all (= goal) critical or harmful states
- 2. Document all paths to the critical or harmful states in a formal way, such as state chart diagrams
 - 3. Model your application (or the software part of it) as a finite state machine

4. Define fail-safe state(s)

5. Implement reliable paths from all nodes to the fail safe state(s)

Justification: If a failed system can transition into a fail-save state, then damage, loss of life or property or other negative consequences may be avoidable (or minimized)





General Resílíence

Architecture Principles

R, Graceful Degradation





http://www.flight.org

Future-Proof Software-Systems [Part 4A]

Example: Degraded airworthiness after engine failure



- Stop right engine
- Engine fire-extinguisher kills the fire
- **Degraded operation**: Fly with one engine
- **Safe-State**: Safe landing at nearest airport



Graceful Degradation = Specific to Resilience Properties





Example: Graceful Degradation in Automatic Teller Machines







Graceful Degradation = Fault Tolerance Engineering



Graceful Degradation = Fault Tolerance Engineering

<u>Fault tolerance</u>: Providing functionality or service

that are consistent with its specification in spite of faults



 \Rightarrow Addition of planned **redundancy** to our systems

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

DEFINITIONS



Resilience Architecture Principle R7:

Graceful Degradation

- 1. Investigate the possibility for graceful degradation in your planned system (= Business task)
- 2. Architect and implement proven graceful degradation technologies (for specific resilience properties, such as availability, performance, safety, security, ...)
 - 3. Compensate component failures by carefully planned *redundancy*

Justification: The value of many systems is significantly improved if after a failure of a component the system operates in a (planned) degraded mode instead of stopping service





General Resílíence

Architecture Principles




APPLICATIONS



System Stack







Use a *resilience infrastructure* as part of a reliable foundation for dependable software-systems

Resilience Infrastructure:

Set of proven resilience technologies and services supporting the dependability properties (availability, security, performance, ...) of software systems

<u>Note 1</u>: Remember «Industry Standards» \Leftarrow Do NOT get boxed in by vendor-specific features

<u>Note 2</u>: Only use proven technology and isolate it via services

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

DEFINITION



Future-Proof Software-Systems [Part 4A] ⇒ Resilience Principles

APPLICATIONS











Dependability Engineer Roles:

- Security Engineer •
- Safety Engineer •
- Availability/Performance Engineer
- ... (all required resilience properties) •

Architecting a Resilience Infrastructure:

- \checkmark Defining the specifications
- \checkmark Selecting the vendors
- \checkmark Integrating into the existing company/product infrastructure
- ✓ Maintenance (Updates, Patches)





Future-Proof Software-Systems [Part 4A]

Example: Role-Based Access Control (RBAC)





R8

Resilience Architecture Principle R8:

Dependable Foundation (Infrastructure)

- 1. Use a resilience infrastructure as part of a dependable foundation for resilient softwaresystems
- 2. Only use *proven* resilience technologies and services supporting the resilience properties (availability, security, performance, ...)
- 3. Whenever possible use industry-standard based resilience techniques (Avoid vendor lockin)

Justification: An implementation of proven resilience techniques in the form of industrystandard products forms a valuable, trustable resilience foundation





General Resílíence

Architecture Principles









Monitoring



An **IT system monitor** is a hardware and software component used to measure resource consumption and performance in a computer system.

Operating Parameter Monitoring



Any **anomaly** in operating parameters (load, response time, ...) is automatically detected and an alarm is triggered ⇒ **Automatic** or **human** intervention



https://www.nethosting.com



Interface/Service Monitoring



Monitoring



Interface/service monitoring is a continuous, real-time activity which assures that:

- An application accepts only syntactically and semantically correct information,
- The interface/service contract conditions are met by the delivering party,

The receiving application cannot be crashed, damaged or mislead by accidental or malicious information.











What should be monitored ?

Network: Operational Parameters

Infrastructure: Operational Parameters

Interfaces/Services: Timing, Syntax & Semantics

Configuration: Changes

Business KPI's: Statistics

Applications: Operational Parameters

Service Level Agreements: Operational Parameters

Dependability Properties: Activity & Parameters

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer: FPSS - WS 17/18

l'echnical

Information

Business

Informatio



What should be monitored ?

Technical Information

Objectives:

- Early problem warning
- System defense
- System optimization
- System intelligence information
- Failure tracing
- \Rightarrow Assure the **non-functional** requirements



Business Information

Objectives:

- Customer satisfaction
- Financial optimization
- Contract (SLA) supervision
- Audit/Compliance
- Business intelligence information
- \Rightarrow Assure the *functional* requirements





20

Resilience Architecture Principle R9:

Monitoring

- 1. Define the objectives of monitoring, both for technical monitoring and the business monitoring
 - 2. Carefully specify the metrics, analytics, results, and alerts to be extracted from monitoring
 - 3. Define the processes for data analysis, including incident/emergency response
 - 4. Specify the actions following alerts whenever fully automated responses
 - 5. Recommendation: Use commercial monitoring tools whenever possible

Justification:

- Technical monitoring is a strong weapon for assuring the non-functional properties of the system and for defending the system against incidents
- Business monitoring strongly contributes to customer satisfaction







Part 4A

