



Chris Hankin
Director of Research

Welcome to the Autumn inter-mediation of the Research Newsletter. The RAE results are now public and once again we were graded 5*. We can no longer say that we are the largest 5* Department, but we can say that we are the largest Department that has been consistently top-rated. Congratulations to you all!

Since the summer inter-mediation, the Department has seen an investment of over £7m (announced grants) for science – well done to John, Yike and the rest of ICPC. The International Review of UK research in Computer Science has been published and says some very positive things about the state of Computer Science research in the UK (including a specific mention of our DSE group).

Research Review

DART Project

A consortium consisting of University of Torino, University of Genova, and Heriot Watt University, and Imperial College, obtained a Global Computing European Community grant, called DART. The coordinator at Imperial College is Sophia Drossopoulou. The project starts on the 1st January 2002, and Christopher Anderson, an MEng4 graduate, will be the Research Associate on that grant.

Industrial Liaison Update

Nicola Rogers has secured some money for an Undergraduate Prize. The company sponsoring it is DST International and they have pledged £3000, to be given out as prizes of £1000 over 3 years. The prize was due to be approved by Academic Committee when it met nearly December.

If you would like to know more about DST they have a website at www.dstinternational.com

FEAST Projects by Manny Lehman

The FEAST project terminated officially in March 2001, FEAST/1 having run from October 1996 to September 1998 and FEAST/2 from April 1999 to March 2001 but group activity continued till September. The investigations set out to study the phenomenon of *software evolution*; to determine the role and impact of *feedback* on software processes and on their improvement. As evidenced by the observed regularities in patterns and trends of evolutionary attributes, the FEAST observations support the hypothesis that process behaviour is constrained by its *system dynamics*. The latter relates to the feedback mechanisms and loop structures of the *full* process that involves analysts, developers, domain specialists, support personnel, marketeers, managers, other agents, methods applied, tools used, users, etc. Success depends on their aggregated activity and is ultimately reflected in stakeholder satisfaction. Sustainable improvement requires feedback mechanisms to be tuned. In the software process this is, however, rarely done. Thus, the complex communication and control loop - structure with its many forward and feedback paths, implies among other things, that the scope for manoeuvre, in terms of achievable system growth or evolution rate for example, is more constrained than is normally assumed.

The presence of feedback phenomenon in software - and other - processes is clear; practical means for its mastery are less obvious. It requires, *inter alia*, the use of metrics, models, interpretations that facilitate reasoning about process - feedback - loop structures. This is illustrated by, for example, the FEAST use of simulation models to assess the impact of alternative evolution strategies. The 35 management rules and guidelines derived from the FEAST observations provide another example. These have a potential to significantly increase prospects for stakeholder satisfaction over application lifetime. These, and many other, FEAST results were derived by analysis of data received from some of the collaborators¹, and from their contributions at the quarterly project workshops. Despite the fact that the systems analysed came from diverse application and implementation domains and that they displayed some differences in the detail of their evolutionary behaviour, the general behaviour was remarkably similar, largely replicating that observed in the 1970s studies. The newer results necessitated only a minor modification of earlier observations as encapsulated, for example, in the laws of software evolution.

The FEAST projects contributed significantly to increased understanding of the software evolution phenomenon and to spreading interest in the topic as illustrated by active research groups in the UK, USA, Europe, Australasia and Japan. The increase in interest is exemplified by a change of name of the Journal of Software Maintenance to Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution and the, now annual, IWPSE workshop at the most recent of which (Kanazawa 2000, Vienna 2001) the FEAST group was invited and gave the Keynote Lectures. In contrast to FEAST, where the focus was on understanding the "what" and "why" of the evolution phenomenon, the emphasis of the majority of the groups is on the "how" of evolution, on methods and tools to *change* software. Active interest in the former issue is also needed.

Understanding of the phenomenon has now reached a level where formalisation can provide benefits such as, in linking rules and guidelines to phenomenological observations. In this regard, a project proposal, SETh An Approach to a Theory of Software Evolution has been submitted to EPSRC. The project, including a group of industrial collaborators, expects to initiate formation of a theory based, *inter alia*, on empirical generalisations suggested by FEAST and other software evolution research.

The FEAST projects were limited to a study of what could be termed the classical software processes as variously practised in industry for the last forty years or so. A second project proposal, EPiCS, is in the final stages of preparation and collaborators that can offer access to their processes are recurrently being sought. It is hoped to address the extension of the feedback and evolution studies to software process paradigms such as OO, component and COTS based architecture, open source programming and soon.

Detailed discussion of the software evolution phenomenon, the FEAST results and other information, including a full version of this article, can be found via links from <http://www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~mml/feast>.

¹Collaborators were BT (FEAST/2 only), DERA, ICL, Logica, Matra - BAe Dynamics, Lucent Technologies (*defacto*)



Recent Grant Announcements

- ✓ J.Darlington, “London Regional E -Science Centre”, £488,000 for three years.
- ✓ J.Darlington, “e -Science Portal at Imperial College”, £605,296 starting January 2002.
- ✓ J.Darlington, “Reality Grid -a tool for investigating condensed matter & Materials”, £3,331,471, for three years, starting January 2002.
- ✓ J.Darlington, “Effective multi -user and multi -job resource utilisation”, £231,119 for two years starting December 2001.
- ✓ J.Darlington, “An open multi -disciplinary parallel computing resource for Imperial College”. £199,750 for three years starting June 2002.
- ✓ YGuo, “DiscoveryNet -an e -Science test bed for high throughput informatics”, £2,082,704 for 3 years starting October 2001.
- ✓ DRueckert, “Building a Probabilistic Atlas of the Heart using MRI Imaging”, £244,228 for three years starting January 2002.
- ✓ DRueckert, “Building a patient -specific model of the heart for integrated diagnosis and treatment of tachyarrhythmias by RF ablation”, £168,986 for 3 years starting October 2001.
- ✓ BRustem/JDarlington, “Parallel Algorithms for Worst -Case Modelling and Risk Management of Dynamic Systems”, £223,202 for 3 years starting October 2001.
- ✓ OMencer, “FASTSTREAM -Data Types and Elementary Functions for Custom Computing”, £66,058 for 3 years starting October 2001.
- ✓ WLuk, “SpeedPaint: a customised computing solution for digital filmmaker”, £135,836 for two years starting January 2002.
- ✓ FToni/FSadri, “SOCS: A computational logic model for the description, analysis and verification of global and open societies of heterogeneous computers”, £278,422 for 3 years starting January 2002.
- ✓ JMagee/JKramer, “STATUS: Software Architecture that supports Usability”, £182,387 (ICSTM share), for 3 years starting December 2001.
- ✓ SDrossopoulou, “DART: Dynamic Assembly, Reconfiguration and Type -checking”, £120,600 (ICSTM share), for 3 years starting January 2002.
- ✓ GZYang, “VIS -a-VE: Visual Augmentation for Virtual Environments in Surgical Training”, £232,427 for 3 years starting June 2002.

Conference Corner



CONCUR2001

Report by Iain Phillips

I attended the 12th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR2001), which was held in August at the University of Aalborg in Denmark. Attendance was good, with some 150 participants.

The opening invited speaker was Robin Milner (Cambridge) talking about “bigraphs”, which are his most recent approach to unifying various popular process calculi, such as the π -calculus and the ambient calculus. The previous approach of “action structures” did not catch on, since people preferred to work in more particular calculi. So unifying theory must offer extra techniques for existing calculi. The promise of bigraphs is that, given a process calculus with an associated notion of reaction, a labelled transition system can be generated by the general theory of bigraphs. In bigraphs the concept of names is as important as it was in CCS and the π -calculus, but the innovations are that locations are now a first class concept, and graphs are more than just an aid to thought. Bigraphs were partly inspired by Philippa Gardner’s work on fusions.

My own talk was on adding priorities to CCS. I got a number of useful comments and suggestions.

There was some discussion of how the subject has moved on since the first CONCUR in 1990. The π -calculus continues to generate papers. Perhaps the most obvious difference is that model checking and probabilistic/stochastic topics loom much larger.

I also attended the Express workshop (program committee including Philippa Gardner) which preceded the main conference, which had some good talks, including a challenge by K. V. S. Prasad (Chalmers) to the prevailing orthodoxy on translations between languages, namely that they should simply preserve and reflect appropriate equivalences. I would say that this is right but there should be more (and many translations do in fact offer more), but it is hard to put it into a theorem.

The conference excursion was to the north of the Jutland peninsula. The two highlights were the Rabjerg Mile, a giant heap of sand which is steadily crossing North Jutland driven by the wind, destroying everything in its path, and the Skagens Gren, the place at the tip of the peninsula where you can walk into the sea along a tiny spit of sand, and place one foot in each “ocean” (the Skagerrak and the Kattegat). In the latter case the metaphor was clear - CONCUR has one foot in theory and one foot in practice. As to the former, I am still not quite clear what the organisers had in mind.

New Members of Staff

Professor Stephen Muggleton
Mrs Amani El -Kholly

Academic Promotions

Warmest congratulations
To Guang -Zhong Yang,
promoted
to a Chair in Medical Image
Computing from October.



New PhDs

Gillian Hill (Steve Vickers)
Francis Bunnin (Yike Guo & John Darlington)
Jieun Kim (Duncan Gillies)

We invite your contributions to build Research Bytes into a relevant and vibrant publication. If you have any contributions that you would like to make such as articles, events for the diary, new funding opportunities, examples of innovation in practice or anything else that you think is relevant please contact me: jtb@doc.ic.ac.uk, or 02075948220. tiveresearch