
A Software Reliability Model Based on a Geometric Sequence of Failure Rates

Stefan Wagner

Software & Systems Engineering

Technische Universität München

Germany

wagnerst@in.tum.de

(joint work with Helmut Fischer, Siemens AG)

June 7, 2006

Introduction

Background and
Motivation

Problem

The Model

Evaluation

Conclusions

Introduction

- *Software reliability engineering* is an established area of software engineering concerned with the measurement and improvement of reliability
- For the measurement typically stochastic models are in use
- They model the failure process and use other software metrics or failure data for the parameter estimation
- They are able to
 - ◆ estimate the current reliability and
 - ◆ predict future failure behaviour
- In Milller (1986) it is suggested that geometric rates (a geometric relationship between the failure rates) are possible
- This behaviour was observed by NASA as documented in Nagel et al. (1982, 1984)

- The underlying problem is the classical *when to stop testing* problem of Siemens products
- For software reliability engineering in general, there is still a need for accurate models for different environments and projects
- Specifically, in the analysed area at Siemens, a geometric sequence of the failure rates of faults was observed
- How can we model that and use it to analyse the test and production failure behaviour?

Introduction

The Model

Basics

Quantities


Time Component

Evaluation


Conclusions

The Model


- Failure rate of a fault: The probability that an existing fault will result in an erroneous behaviour of the system during a defined time slot or while executing an average operation
- Assumption: There are many more faults with high failure rates than with low failure rates
- Hence the distribution of failure rates of faults looks like this:



- Failure rate of a fault: The probability that an existing fault will result in an erroneous behaviour of the system during a defined time slot or while executing an average operation
- Assumption: There are many more faults with high failure rates than with low failure rates
- Using a logarithmic scale:



- Failure rate of a fault: The probability that an existing fault will result in an erroneous behaviour of the system during a defined time slot or while executing an average operation
- Assumption: There are many more faults with high failure rates than with low failure rates




Hence, the failure rates can be approximated as follows:

$$p_n = p_1 \cdot d^{(n-1)}, \quad (1)$$

where p_n is the failure rate of the n -th fault, p_1 the failure rate of the first fault, and d is a project-specific parameter.

- We assume a geometrical distribution of the failure occurrences
- Based on this, we can derive all usual quantities
 - ◆ Mean number of failures (μ)
 - ◆ Failure intensity (λ)
 - ◆ Time to reach a certain reliability level (Δt)
- Based on *incidents* as time
- An incident is a typical usage task of the system



Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of
Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity –
Approach

Predictive Validity –
Results

Conclusions

Evaluation

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity –
Approach

Predictive Validity –
Results

Conclusions

- Main Assumption: geometrical relationship of failure rates of faults

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity – Approach

Predictive Validity – Results

Conclusions

- Main Assumption: geometrical relationship of failure rates of faults
supported by Nagel et al. (1982, 1984), tendency also by Adams (1984)

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity – Approach

Predictive Validity – Results

Conclusions

- Main Assumption: geometrical relationship of failure rates of faults
supported by Nagel et al. (1982, 1984), tendency also by Adams (1984)
- The occurrence of a failure is geometrically distributed

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity – Approach

Predictive Validity – Results

Conclusions

- Main Assumption: geometrical relationship of failure rates of faults
supported by Nagel et al. (1982, 1984), tendency also by Adams (1984)
- The occurrence of a failure is geometrically distributed
fits to the considered discrete incidents

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity – Approach

Predictive Validity – Results

Conclusions

- Main Assumption: geometrical relationship of failure rates of faults
supported by Nagel et al. (1982, 1984), tendency also by Adams (1984)
- The occurrence of a failure is geometrically distributed
fits to the considered discrete incidents
- Infinite number of faults

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity – Approach

Predictive Validity – Results

Conclusions

- Main Assumption: geometrical relationship of failure rates of faults
supported by Nagel et al. (1982, 1984), tendency also by Adams (1984)
- The occurrence of a failure is geometrically distributed
fits to the considered discrete incidents
- Infinite number of faults
Imperfect debugging

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of
Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity –
Approach

Predictive Validity –
Results

Conclusions

- Real application only in telecommunications domain
- During evaluation of predictive validity also used on data from other domains
- In principle usable during system test, field trial, and field use

- Concept of *incidents* does not fit to all domains

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of

Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity –

Approach

Predictive Validity –

Results

Conclusions

- Consideration of faults and failures complicated
- Each fault has a different failure distribution
- Infinite number of faults difficult for tool support
- The two parameters have an interpretation:
 - ◆ p_1 : highest failure probability
 - ◆ d : system complexity

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of

Assumptions

Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity –
Approach

Predictive Validity –
Results

Conclusions

- Comparison of predicted and measured numbers of failures and several points in time
- Relative error: $(\hat{\mu}(t_q) - q)/q$
- Models:
 - ◆ Musa basic
 - ◆ Musa-Okumoto
 - ◆ Littlewood-Verall
 - ◆ NHPP
- Data Sets:
 - ◆ Telecommunication systems from Siemens
 - ◆ DoD DACS data

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Quality of Assumptions


Applicability

Simplicity

Predictive Validity – Approach

Predictive Validity – Results

Conclusions



Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Conclusions

Summary

Future Work

Conclusions

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Conclusions

Summary

Future Work

- Software reliability model based on a geometric series of the failure rates of the faults
- Suggested by theory and practice
- Predictive validity similar to existing models
- More consistent over different projects

Introduction

The Model

Evaluation

Conclusions

Summary

Future Work

- Early determination of model parameters by correlation with other measures
- Improved time component
- Further evaluation on other projects
- Improved tool support