Contract Aware Components, 10 years after

Antoine Beugnard, Jean-Marc Jézéquel, Noël Plouzeau

Contract Aware Components, 10 years after

Antoine Beugnard

Telecom Bretagne
Brest, France

`antoine.beugnard@telecom-bretagne.eu`

Jean-Marc Jézéquel

IRISA
Rennes, France

`jezequel@irisa.fr`

Noël Plouzeau

`plouzeau@irisa.fr`

The notion of *contract aware components* has been published roughly ten years ago and is now becoming mainstream in several fields where the usage of software components is seen as critical. The goal of this paper is to survey domains such as Embedded Systems or Service Oriented Architecture where the notion of contract aware components has been influential. For each of these domains we briefly describe what has been done with this idea and we discuss the remaining challenges.

1   Introduction

In a special issue of IEEE Computer published in July 1999, we published an article entitled *Making Components Contract Aware*. The goal of this article was to discuss the extension of Meyer's Design-By-Contract idea to the world of software components. Our finding were that component contracts would have to deal with specific concerns that we classified into four categories, from syntactic to semantic to synchronization, up to Quality of Service.

There is empirical evidence that this article has got some lasting impact on the field of Component Based Software Engineering. For instance, on June 2010 it has been cited 545 times by other papers (according to Google Scholar). Several of these papers themselves got quite a sizable number of citations. Impacted domains include[1]:

Components: *Software reuse strategies and component markets* [24] (81 citations), *Specification, implementation, and deployment of components* [12] (80 citations), *Interface Compatibility Checking for Software Modules* [9] (78 citations)

Adaptation: *Composing Adaptive Software* [20] (281 citations), *A Taxonomy of Compositional Adaptation* [19] (53 citations)

Internet (beyond components): *Information agent technology for the Internet: A survey* [17] (199 citations), *WSOL – Web Service Offerings Language* [29] (106 citations)

Real-time: *Monitoring, Testing and Debugging of Distributed Real-Time Systems* [28] (90 citations)

High Performance Computing: *A Component Architecture for High-Performance Scientific Computing* [1] (86 citations)

This has prompted us to try to reflect upon the evolution of the contract-aware components domain roughly ten years after the publication of our article in IEEE Computer (we will refer to this article as the MCCA paper in the following sections). The goal of the present paper is thus to highlight domains where the notion of contract aware components has been influential, to briefly describe what has been done with this idea and to discuss the remaining challenges. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly recall the main ideas discussed in our original paper. In Section 3 we give an

---

[1]Number in parenthesis is the number of citations of this paper according to Google Scholar.

overview of the state of the art with respect to contract-aware components in domains such as Embedded Systems or Service Oriented Architecture. We conclude the paper with a discussion on the possible evolutions of the contract concept.

2   Original paper summary

Ten years ago, we proposed in [7] to apply B. Meyer's Design by Contract [21] principles to components with an attempt at generalization. We introduced a classification of contracts in four levels, and beyond a simple verification use of contract, the possibility to manage and negotiate contracts at runtime.

The classification, like all classifications, expresses a point of view that we discuss a little further (section 4). It can be summarized as:

Syntactic (or basic) The goal is to make the system work. It is generally specified with Interface Definition Languages (IDLs), as well as typed object-based or object-oriented languages. It ensures the components can be assembled.

Behavioral The goal is to specify each operation. It is generally specified with a couple of assertions: a precondition and a postcondition. It ensures the operations offered and required are not only syntactically compatible but also semantically.

Synchronization The goal is to specify the coordination of operations. It can be specified with an automaton labelled with operations. It ensures the operations are used in the proper order.

Quality of Service The goal is to quantify a few features associated to operations. Performance, availability and quality of result can be specified and negotiated at that level.

This classification clearly helps to structure the specification and to understand the coverage of requirements a component has.

The structural decomposition that we proposed also introduces a temporal decomposition with a contract management life-cycle. The main idea is to reify contracts (defining contracts as objects). The life-cycle can be summarized as follows:

Define Describe the component features with all required contracts. A component is considered in isolation.

Subscribe Select from all contracts those that are useful in the context of component use, and configure them. Components are assembled (used) with an intent.

Check Evaluate contracts and react accordingly. The moment the checking is carried out depends on the level of contract: usually levels 1 and 2 can be statically checked while levels 3 and 4 require some runtime monitoring. In some cases, level 3 can be statically checked. In the case of a contract violation we proposed 4 kinds of reactions: ignore, reject, wait or negotiate.

Terminate Decide when to stop evaluating contracts.

The 4-level structural classification is oriented towards the nature of the constraints that have to be specified. As we will see later (section 4) space and time information are other classification dimensions that can be considered.

In the next section, we focus on some application domains in order to analyze how contracts were used.

3   Related work

Contracts have been applied in many fields. They help to design and structure both the product and the production process. In this section we focus on examples which range from the less flexible architectures (closed embedded systems) to the most flexible ones (service oriented architectures) through an intermediate flexible architecture (component based systems). This shows that "contract awareness" is not limited to components, but can efficiently be extended to other paradigms such as services.

3.1   Embedded Systems

In recent years, the notion of contract aware components has clearly percolated in the domain of Real-Time Embedded Systems. For instance, the Artist network of excellence supported a research cluster on Component-Based Software Development where the notion of contract was central. However, a key characteristic of component-based embedded systems is the wide heterogeneity of component models. This heterogeneity can be found in different execution models (synchronous, asynchronous, vs. timed), different communication models (synchronous vs. asynchronous), as well as different scheduling paradigms. Designing heterogeneous embedded systems from diverse types of components, and allowing the prediction and optimization of functional and non-functional properties of the designed systems is still an open challenge [4]. Thus there is a need to develop an innovative theory for building complex heterogeneous systems which better addresses composability and compositionality issues [26]. Such a comprehensive theory is still missing today, thereby making it difficult to understand how to build systems that combine, e.g., synchronously and asynchronously executing components and reason about non-functional properties, but this is the subject of very active research (e.g. as published in the Emsoft conferences).

It is also now acknowledged that a key issue in component-based embedded software development is about handling non-functional properties (including real-time and QoS properties). The notion of a rich component model [13, 5] is thus gaining momentum to help engineers to model, specify, and predict timing, QoS, and resources properties of components and of systems composed from components. Still, typical support for handling QoS and resource usage is rather limited.

Specific non-functional (level 4) contracts are dealt with in ad hoc manners. For timing properties, different variants of timed automata have been used, as in, e.g., the Omega component model [14]. For properties relating to queuing and performance, models based on queueing networks, Markov chains, etc. have been used. These approaches offer a precise mechanism for specifying and analyzing QoS properties, but they suffer from scalability problems.

In Real-Time Embedded Component-Based Systems, level 3 contracts are also of prime importance to manage both expectations of the component about its environment and guarantees offered in return by the component to its environment. An example of level 3 contracts is the notion of *interface automata* [2], viewed as enriched type systems (the so-called *behavioral type systems*), which capture the ordering aspects of software component interactions. Interface automata provide a semantically well-founded, built-in notion of refinement: a component refines another one if it imposes weaker constraints about the environment and offers stronger guarantees in return [9].

UML emerged in recent years as a modeling standard for software, including software for embedded systems for which specific UML profiles have been developed. A first attempt was made with the UML Profile for Schedulability, Performance, and Time (SPT) to model real-time concerns. However, the SPT profile suffered from several shortcomings, and was quickly superseded by the MARTE profile (Modeling and Analysis of Real-Time and Embedded systems), which better addresses issues such as compliance with the UML2.0 specification of not only real-time constraints but also other embedded

Figure 1: The SPEEDS vision: Design enriched by contracts

QoS characteristics such as memory and power consumption, modeling and analysis of component-based architectures, and the capability to model systems in different modeling paradigms (asynchronous, synchronous, and timed). Still very few tools are currently able to exploit MARTE to its full extent.

In this domain, SPEEDS (SPEculative and Exploratory Design in Systems Engineering) is another example of a recently completed European project that developed contracts and multi-viewpoint as core concepts (see Figure 1).

SPEEDS has delivered a solution based on enriching functional decomposition with contracts, *i.e.* textual and formal descriptions of functional and non-functional aspects. The SPEEDS version of contracts give abstract descriptions of the exposed properties of a component, classified as *assumptions* (requirements of the component with respect to its environment) and *promises* (guaranteed delivered properties of the component provided its assumptions have been fulfilled). According to the documentation produced by the SPEEDS project[2], typical contracts specifying the behaviour of a component (used as promises) could be for instance:

- The output *out* is the sum of the inputs *in1* and *in2*.

- Every request will be served.

- A request will be served within 10 ms.

Conversely, examples of behavioural contracts used as assumptions could be:

- Input data *in1* will never show a negative value.

- The data rate of in1 will not exceed one message in 10 ms.

SPEEDS has provided a complete framework for modeling, combining, analyzing and managing such multi-viewpoint, enriched models.

---

[2]http://www.speeds.eu.com/

3.2   Component architectures

Contracts have gained first class status in recent years. The set of concepts used to describe and manage them is now very rich. More than ten years ago, the first approaches relied on a static model of contract. For instance, an operation definition may provide a non negotiable precondition (the caller cannot negotiate the precondition) and also a non negotiable postcondition. While this may be sufficient for level 2 contracts (especially if one considers level 2 contracts as a type mechanism) this scheme is too static to maximise reuse and adaptation to evolving needs. Hence a negotiation model is required. In turn this implies that contracts have complex features and that they are much more than a pair of precondition/postcondition predicates.

In this section we use the Confract approach [11] as an example architecture to illustrate elaborate means of contract management (especially negotiation and monitoring). Confract is a contract management framework for the Fractal [8] component model. Fractal has a rich component life cycle, which in turn allows for rich contract lifecycle with high possibilities regarding dynamic contracts. As in most modern contract based systems, a Confract contract is a negotiated agreement between several parties whose responsibilities are clearly stated for each contract feature. Confract allows for several kind of contracts, depending on the location that receives them:

- interface contracts describe agreement between a service provider and a service client;

- external composition contracts express compound usage rules for a component, defining how a component can be used globally (such contracts encompasses several interfaces);

- internal composition contracts define how internal components are connected to external interfaces.

The various contract locations mentioned above show that the cooperation properties are more central than in the case of initial *design by contract* approach.

The set of specifications is at the heart of Confract: a contract is a "collaboration hub". Through a set of operations entities (component instances), the partners select the specification items that they are interested in (either as service provider of service consumer) with adequate values for the specification parameters. Once partners have reached an agreement on a specification term, this term is "closed". A closed term includes a contract manager (which is in charge of managing the violation of this term), contributors (which strive at ensuring the contract term by providing services) and beneficiaries (which are customers of the contract bound services). When all terms are closed, the contract can be instantiated and used.

In a typical architecture, an instantiated contract is a reference to monitor the activities of the partner and detect contract violations. This contract instance is at the center of the collaboration management. In service based systems and also in evolving component based systems configurations can be computed on the fly and therefore contract models must also take these evolutions into account. Techniques such as model driven engineering help to master reconfiguration and they play a key role in contract management. More precisely, the "model at runtime" technique [22] allows for a precise reconfiguration control of a running system. This includes the analysis of contract validity on an evolving architecture.

3.3   Service Oriented Architecture

Contract management is central to Service Oriented Architecture design. With respect to component based architectures, service oriented ones are characterized by the highly dynamic configuration and reconfiguration capabilities that they require. As in component based architecture, SOA contracts are

the key concept to setup cooperation between entities. But SOA contracts have a richer lifecycle: they are not set in stone at design time but are much more malleable than design time component contracts. Conditions that were favorable to the definition of a cooperation at a given time and place may change at any moment and this change lead to a deal break. In turn this implies a reaction from the contract partners, from a basic renegotiation of bounds to a contract cancellation. In the spirit of service oriented architectures, such contract volatility is not a bug but an essential feature.

This high level of dynamicity has a profound impact on the way to create, configure and supervise contract. This leads to a large set of concepts (see [16] for an example of such conceptual framework). Hereafter we will mention some points on configuration and monitoring of contracts in a SOA context.

The terminology of the SOA domain includes the notion of service level agreement (SLA). There is a connection between the contract notion (in the sense described in the previous section on components) and the SLA concept. Both concepts share the idea of mutual agreement on provided and consumed services. However, while component contracts are based on precise notions of quality, referring to low level items of execution (e.g. maximum time between service invocation and service termination events), SLA properties refer to higher level properties, abstracting many execution details and often using stochastic descriptions. SLA deals with the global performance of a system as a service provider, and SLA descriptions include various metrics concerns and dimensions, such as business metrics: financial properties, for instance a billing computation formula based on stochastic behavior of a compound metrics (e.g. mean execution time of a service during the last hour, etc).

Contract creation and configuration   Strictly speaking, contracts are created from offers, once offers have been read, chosen and configured. In the component design world, components are interconnected through ports and in many component metamodels, the relationship between a provided port and a required port is bidirectional and represented by a connector (explicitly or implicitly). A contract is built from a required properties part bound to the requiring/client port, matched with provided properties bound to the provider port.

Regarding negotiation aspects, SOA offers a wide range of possibilities for every contract level, in the sense of initial MCCA article:

1. level 1 negotiation is realized by the service discovery mechanism inherent to service based systems; the notions of type compatibility are managed there;

2. level 2 negotiation is also connected to service discovery: pre and postconditions are a form of type definition that extends data type definitions;

3. level 3 is realized by the definition of an orchestration; usually negotiation is limited because orchestrations are more static than the services they rely upon;

4. level 4 is realized by service level agreement mechanisms.

Monitoring services   This dynamic approach requires that SOA contracts have to be supervised at all times, contrary to a more static view of contract composition analysis from the embedded or component systems design. In practice, the monitoring system is generated and configured by the contract management infrastructure. Monitoring can be performed by external parties in order to obtain a neutral point of view of the compliance of the interested parties to the contract.

With respect to the classification of the MCCA paper, monitors can manage different contract levels: monitoring systems such as the one in [3] rely on an infrastructure that can accept plugins for various

monitoring tactics, with a rule-based engine to trigger reaction strategies. Reaction strategies may adapt monitors and monitoring rules, as well as strategies that retry, rebind or reorganize.

Regarding monitoring, service based architectures address the four MCCA levels with very different techniques:

1. level 1 contracts can be managed by WSDL alike service descriptions, with a type system that is loose enough to deal with heterogeneity and fast paced evolution; contract compliance is computed by loose type computation and checking;

2. level 2 contracts can be described by pre and postcondition and can be checked by weaving monitors, inserting adapters, etc [3];

3. level 3 contracts can be addressed by orchestrations, which somewhat can ease contract monitoring because the control is centralized;

4. level 4 contracts can be addressed by SLA validation and monitoring

Monitoring techniques are different for embedded architectures and service based systems:

- service based designs have limited possibilities of static analysis tools because of the highly dynamic nature of these systems. Checking can be done at run time only: at contract negotiation time, during the execution of service requests, at system reconfiguration time;

- the consequences of contract violation differ between traditional component based systems and service based ones. The goals of monitoring are therefore different: for embedded architectures, monitoring is a complement to more static analysis and validation techniques; for service based systems monitoring is a first class concept that is an integral part of the contract life cycle.

- monitors for embedded systems can be generated statically and injected in the main system code infrastructure to allow for efficient violation detections and fast error management [25]; on the contrary dynamic systems such as service based architectures are more difficult to generate in advance and violation management policies can also be defined dynamically.

3.4 Other work

The initial application field of the MCCA paper was components. A wide interpretation of the word component is allowed and leads to several applications of contracts. Moreover, as discussed in section 4, a contract can be attached to many kinds of component: from operation (tiny "component") to system (huge "component"). In this section we describe briefly other work using contracts.

A recent interesting work has been realized by [30]. The author proposed an agile framework for the evolution of systems based on components and services. Figure 3 shows the whole development process. Four types of contracts (gray boxes) are used at different stages of the process with different tools. Some contracts are used with static checkers in order to prove architectural static properties while other contracts are transformed and integrated into the code to enable observations and runtime monitoring. This work shows that contracts can be a natural interface in order to mix and assembly components and services as in the Service Component Architecture initiative.

In 2000, the OMG introduces the MDA (Model Driven Architecture) initiative [27]. Beyond the UML or MOF dependency of this approach, this initiative promotes a systematic use of models (whatever the modeling language) and of model transformations (whatever the transformation language) that describes design decisions. In [15], E. Kaboré used contracts to specify all transformations; constraints on input and output models are considered as pre and postconditions on transformations.

More recently, A. Koudri proposed Modal [18] a process model to interpret parts of a software development process as "process components" which, hence, allows to attach contracts to them.

Figure 2: A full process with contracts from [30]

4   Discussion on the classification

As for any classification, our four levels contract classification expresses a point of view and can be discussed. The point of view of the MCCA paper is to consider the component as a whole and not to consider it as a set of parts such as interfaces, ports or other "components". A contract is then attached to a component, but this position is easily reconsidered with contracts attached to components parts. Basic and semantic contracts are naturally linked to operations, themselves grouped into interfaces or ports whatever the boundary of the component is composed of. Synchronization (or coordination) and quality of service contracts describe more global features and are easily attached to the component itself. In his thesis, G. Waignier [30] proposes a systematic approach using contracts at many structural levels: operation, port, whole component, assembly of components (this is made possible by the Confract component model [11])

The levels that are the most subject to interpretation are the behavior and synchronization ones. This is probably because synchronization is a part of the component behavior and that languages used to specify operation semantics in preconditions and postconditions are rich enough to describe control states. In a strict interpretation of the behavioral contract, the operation specification is stateless and makes no assumption on the state of the component. For instance, a deposit in a BankAccount is `balance += amount;` whatever the BankAccount status (non-existing, open, closed, deleted, etc.) is. Unfortunately, languages such as OCL allows references to variables that can encode a state, introducing a synchronization-level issue in the behavioral level. In order to remove this moving borderline, the Accord project [6] proposes a classification in only three levels: syntactic, semantic and pragmatic. But, this usual classification in language theory introduces a new kind of ambiguity; pragmatic aspects usually denote the way things are used. Therefore, is the synchronization contract that describes the way operations are used a pragmatic contract (from the operation point of view) or a semantic contract (from the component - as a unit - point of view)?

Finally, a completely different and complementary classification is based on the moment a contract is designed within the design process. All contracts are defined and refined during the whole development process. A more precise classification can define requirement contracts, specification contracts, design contracts, implementation contracts and runtime contracts. UML Components [10] and G. Waignier [30] rely on such an approach.

As a conclusion for this discussion on contract classifications we can distinguish three dimensions :

1. the nature of the contract, as in the MCCA initial proposal

2. the location of the contract;

3. the process moment (time position) of the contract.

The nature of a contract depends on its attachment and its position in the development cycle of a component. All these contracts have compatibility constraints that need to be analyzed along the process. The classification of the nature of the contract is finally a convenient tool to decompose constraints, requirements or rules and is probably business dependent. In fact, the classification is just a tool that helps improve the trust we can have in the coverage (not to say the completeness) of a contract-based specification.

5   Conclusion

Beyond the primary idea of Design by Contracts [21] which was a pragmatic and systematic way of using pre/post conditions in a functional (or object-oriented) world, the idea to generalize the use of contracts to components leads to many interesting works.

Contracts are a natural way to decompose and structure specifications. It appears that a contract can be attached to almost any software entity. One of the main challenges is probably to deal with the many kinds of contracts and of contracts checkers. But even if contacts are widely used, they are not yet a first-class entity in UML or even standard profiles.

A fundamental question that arises is the role of contracts in the specification of software entities. Can we consider the set of contracts as "the" specification of a service or a component? Another important question is the life cycle of contracts. Some contracts can be directly used and statically checked while others need to be refined and give birth to monitors, checkers and negotiation artifacts. The refinement process of contracts depends on the level of contract and is tightly coupled to the software entity development process itself with the underlying question; what has to be exposed in the contract, what has to be hidden or, in other words, what is the level of grayness of the specification.[3]

Beyond the specification of a single entity, the contract concept is now central to many software architectures. Yet many complex questions need to be answered: which contract metamodels are relevant for a given system, how can designers conciliate different metamodels stemming from various parts that are combined to build a system, how can one integrate dynamic contract negotiation, etc.

So, ten years later, the concept of contract still appears attractive but has probably not reached a level of maturity that would allow a large use in industry. Rendezvous in ten more years . . .

References

[1] Bernholdt et al. (2006): *A Component Architecture for High-Performance Scientific Computing*. International *Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* , pp. 163 – 202.

[2] Luca de Alfaro, Thomas A. Henzinger & Mariëlle Stoelinga (2002): *Timed Interfaces*. In: *Embedded Software, Second International Conference, EMSOFT 2002, Grenoble, France, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2491, Springer, pp. 108–122.

[3] L. Baresi, C. Ghezzi & S. Guinea (1992): *Applying 'Design by Contract'*. *Contributions to ubiquitous computing* , pp. 40 – 52.

---

[3]On this topic, the WCSI paper [23] provides an interesting view.

[4] Ananda Basu, Marius Bozga & Joseph Sifakis (2006): *Modeling Heterogeneous Real-time Components in BIP*. In: *SEFM*, pp. 3–12.

[5] Albert Benveniste, Benoît Caillaud, Alberto Ferrari, Leonardo Mangeruca, Roberto Passerone & Christos Sofronis (2007): *Multiple Viewpoint Contract-Based Specification and Design*. In: *Formal Methods for Components and Objects, 6th International Symposium, FMCO 2007, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 24-26, 2007, Revised Lectures, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 5382, Springer, pp. 200–225.

[6] Antoine Beugnard, Olivier Caron, Jean-Philippe Thibault & Bruno Traverson (2005): *Assemblage de composants par contrats. Le modèle de composants ACCORD. RSTI - L'Objet* 11(4), pp. 11 – 46.

[7] Antoine Beugnard, Jean-Marc Jezéquel, Noël Plouzeau & Damien Watkins (1999): *Making components contract aware*. Computer 32(7), pp. 38 – 45.

[8] E. Bruneton, T. Coupaye, M. Leclercq, V. Quéma & J.B. Stefani (2006): *The fractal component model and its support in java*. Software: Practice and Experience 36(11-12), pp. 1257–1284.

[9] Arindam Chakrabarti, Luca de Alfaro, Thomas A. Henzinger, Marcin Jurdziński & Freddy Y. C. Mang (2002): *Computer Aided Verification*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2404/2002, chapter Interface Compatibility Checking for Software Modules, pp. 654 – 663. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, springer berlin/heidelberg edition.

[10] John Cheesman & John Daniels (2000): *UML Components*. Addison-Wesley.

[11] Philippe Collet, Jacques Malenfant, Ozanne & Nicolas Rivierre (2007): *Composite contract enforcement in hierarchical component systems*. In: *6th International Symposium (SC 2007)*, 4829, Springer-Verlag, pp. 18 – 33.

[12] Ivica Crnkovic, Brahim Hnich, Torsten Jonsson & Zeynep Kiziltan (2002): *Specification, implementation, and deployment of components*. Commun. ACM 45(10), pp. 35–40.

[13] Werner Damm (2005): *Controlling Speculative Design Processes Using Rich Component Models*. In: *Fifth International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD 2005), 6-9 June 2005, St. Malo, France*, IEEE Computer Society, pp. 118–119.

[14] Werner Damm, Bernhard Josko, Amir Pnueli & Angelika Votintseva (2005): *A discrete-time UML semantics for concurrency and communication in safety-critical applications*. Sci. Comput. Program. 55(1-3), pp. 81–115.

[15] Eveline C. Kaboré (2008): *Contribution à l'automatisation d'un processus de construction d'abstractions de communication par transformations successives de modèles*. Ph.D. thesis, Télécom Bretagne/Université de Rennes 1, France.

[16] A. Keller & H. Ludwig (2003): *The WSLA framework: Specifying and monitoring service level agreements for web services*. Journal of Network and Systems Management 11(1), pp. 57–81.

[17] Matthias Klusch (2001): *Information agent technology for the Internet: A survey*. In: *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 36, Elsevier, pp. 337 – 372.

[18] Ali Koudri & Joel Champeau (2010): *MODAL: A SPEM Extension to Improve Co-design Process Models*. In: *International Conference on Software Process (ICSP'10)*, Paderborn, Germany.

[19] Philip. K. McKinley, Seyed Masoud Sadjadi, Eric P. Kasten & Betty H. C. Cheng (2004): *A Taxonomy of Compositional Adaptation*. Technical Report MSU-CSE-04-17, Software Engineering and Network Systems Laboratory, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Michigan State University.

[20] Philip K. McKinley, Seyed Masoud Sadjadi, Eric P. Kasten & Betty H.C. Cheng (2004): *Composing Adaptive Software*. Computer 37, pp. 56–64.

[21] Bertrand Meyer (1992): *Applying "Design by Contract "*. Computer 25(10), pp. 40 – 51.

[22] Brice Morin, Olivier Barais, Jean-Marc Jézéquel, Franck Fleurey & Arnor Solberg (2009): *Models at Runtime to Support Dynamic Adaptation*. IEEE Computer , pp. 46–53Available at `http://www.irisa.fr/triskell/publis/2009/Morin09f.pdf`.

[23] Meriem Ouederni & Gwen Salün (2010): *Tau Be or not Tau Be? A Perspective on Service Compatibility and Substituability*. In: *WCSI workshop on Componenet and Service Interoperability.*, Malaga, Spain.

[24] T. Ravichandran & Marcus A. Rothenberger (2003): *Software reuse strategies and component markets*. Commun. ACM 46(8), pp. 109–114.

[25] Sébastien Saudrais, Olivier Barais, Laurence Duchien & Noël Plouzeau (2007): *From formal specifications to QoS monitors*. Journal of Object Technology, Special Issue on Advances in Quality of Service Management 6(11), pp. 7–24. Available at `http://www.irisa.fr/triskell/publis/2007/Saudrais07e.pdf`.

[26] Joseph Sifakis (2009): *Component-Based Construction of Real-Time Systems in BIP*. In: *Computer Aided Verification, 21st International Conference, CAV 2009, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 5643, Springer, pp. 33–34.

[27] Richard Soley & the OMG Staff Strategy Group (2000). *Model Driven Architecture*. White Paper. Draft 3.2.

[28] Henrik Thane (2000): *Monitoring, Testing and Debugging of Distributed Real-Time Systems*. Ph.D. thesis, Mechatronics Laboratory, Department of Machine Design, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden.

[29] Vladimir Tosic, Kruti Patel & Bernard Pagurek (2002): *Web Services, E-Business, and the Semantic Web*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2512/2002, chapter WSOL – Web Service Offerings Language, pp. 57 – 67. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, springer berlin / heidelberg edition.

[30] Guillaume Waignier (2010): *Canevas de développement agile pour l'évolution fiable de systèmes logiciels à composants et orientés services*. Ph.D. thesis, Université de Lille 1, France.