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ABSTRACT

The first step in automatic programming is the statement of information requirements in a Requirements Statement Language (RSL), a language for stating system requirements without needing to state the procedures implementing the system. The objective of this paper is development of language design principles for an RSL offering extensive requirements statement facilities. This objective is achieved through the formulation of a formal description of an information processing system. The formal description provides the criteria for requirements statement facilities of an RSL and for the capabilities of software for requirements statement analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Widespread concern with the quality of software is evidenced by the proliferation of methods to improve the maintainability, extensibility, and reliability of software. Indicative of this trend, interest in structured programming is particularly high.

However, the widespread expansion of computer applications coupled with the less spectacular growth in sources of programming manpower makes even structured programming only a short-term solution to improving programmer productivity. Hence, this need for a long-term solution motivates the development of tools for automatic or computer-aided production of software. To a great extent, the ultimate success of automatic programming hinges upon the facilities made available to the user for specification of his requirements for the information system he desires. A Requirements Statement Language (RSL) is a non-procedural high-level language that permits the statement of requirements for an information system without stating the procedures necessary for implementation of the system. The effective use of an RSL is aided by a Requirements Statement Analyzer (RSA), a program that performs syntactical and logical analysis of an RSL statement. Then an RSA produces a coded statement to be used by other software components that perform physical system design tasks or automatically produce source language code implementing the information system described by the RSL statement.

As a proposed solution to a recognized need, the RSL concept is now receiving increased attention in the computing community. Teichroew [1] surveys seven proposed languages and describes several desirable features of an RSL. Recent references include Couger [2], Leavenworth and Sammet [3], Benjamin [4], Merten and Teichroew [5], and McGee [6]. Earlier references include Fralishore [7]. It is interesting to note the similarity between the philosophies of requirements statement and of structured programming. Since requirements statement involves only the definition of system requirements without specifying the procedures for meeting those requirements, crucial design decisions are postponed until later in the system development cycle. In the same way, structured programming [8] advocates the postponement of design decisions, particularly regarding data representation, until after the algorithm has first been abstractly specified.

This paper develops a formal model of an information system. This formal model provides the framework for statement of the criteria for requirements statement facilities of an RSL and for the logical capabilities of an RSA.

HISTORICAL AND TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

To meet the needs outlined above, the Information Systems Design and Optimization System (ISDOS) Project at the University of Michigan has been studying the systems building process with the objective of developing a methodology for computer-aided design and construction of information systems. A description of the ISSOS Project can be found in Teichroew and Sayan [9]. ISDOS was born at Case Institute of Technology (now Case-Western Reserve University) in 1967 and was moved to the University of Michigan in 1968. Affiliation with Purdue University is also maintained through the efforts of Dr. Jay F. Nunamaker, an original member of the ISSOS Project at Case.

The work at ISSOS has involved both the study of existing techniques for requirements statement and the development of new Requirements Statement Languages. All techniques view the problem in essentially the same way. They describe how to produce outputs from inputs. All techniques provide some method for describing data relationships as the user views them. They provide some facility for stating the requirements of the problem. Several provide some facility for stating other data such as time and volume.
Young and Kent [10] represent the earliest work. Information Algebra is the work of the CODASYL Development Committee [11]. Two other efforts have been reported by Langoefors [12 and 13] and Lombardi [14]. Accurately Defined Systems (ADS) is a product of the National Cash Register Company [15] and is described by Lynch [16]. The Time Automated Grid (TAG) system, a product of IBM, was developed by Myers [17] and is described by Kelly [18].

ADS and TAG use a practical, straightforward approach without attempting to develop any "theory" of data processing. ADS and TAG are systematic ways of recording the information that a systems analyst would gather. ADS or TAG could be used by any experienced systems analyst with very little instruction.

Young and Kent and Information Algebra represent a problem definition approach that is more concerned with developing a theory. Both use a terminology and develop a notation that is not at all natural to most analysts.

Lombardi's approach requires the completion of the system design before it can be used and resembles a non-procedural programming language rather than an abstract, unstructured approach. However, Lombardi's work is relevant because it presents a non-procedural technique for stating requirements once the file processing runs have been determined. Langoefors' technique uses the concept of precedence relationships among processes and files without indicating how these relationships are obtained and is relevant to the analysis of a problem statement rather than to the design of a system. However, it does suggest a number of desirable features of a requirements statement technique.

Despite the availability of these RSL techniques, their use has not been extensive. To the best of our knowledge, the languages of Young and Kent and of Lombardi have not been used except in an experimental way. Information Algebra has been used only once by Katz and McIntyre [19]. It appears that the development and use of TAG has been discontinued by IBM. ADS appears to be gaining in user acceptance. The U. S. Navy [20], in the process of designing a financial system, and a number of other firms [21] have used ADS as a requirements statement technique.

This current work is the result of an evolutionary process involving several different RSL's. The first development SSL/I (SODA Statement Language/I) is the work of Nunamaker [22]. SODA (Systems Optimization and Design Algorithm) is an ISDOS software component that produces specifications for program module and storage structure and for hardware selection from the requirements analyzed by an RSA. Extension of SSL/I resulted in the development of PSL/I (Problem Statement Language/I) described by Koch, Krohn, McGrew, and Sibley [23]. Experience with PSL/I indicated its shortcomings and led to PSL/II possessing improvements suggested by Hershey, Nataj, and Teichroew [24]. Simultaneously with the development of PSL/I experience with ADS demonstrated the value of a forms-oriented RSL for ease of requirements statement.

OVERVIEW OF THREE REQUIREMENTS STATEMENT LANGUAGES

Past experience with requirements statement techniques has indicated that no existing requirements statement technique is adequate for the complete expression of user requirements relevant to all aspects of systems design and optimization. This deficiency motivated the initial development of SSL/I, the subsequent development of PSL/II, and examination of ADS for desirable features.

ADS is forms-oriented, making it easy to use and still capable of specifying much of the basic requirements statement. SSL/I possesses additional capabilities, particularly in the specification of operational requirements consisting of information on volumes, frequency of output, and timing of input and output. Finally, PSL/II exhibits more powerful generalized facilities for data description, processing requirements, and operational requirements.

MOTIVATION

Couger [2] acknowledges a lag in the development of systems analysis techniques. Our need for increased systems analysis capabilities stems from our failure to define systems analysis rigorously so that the discipline can be better characterized as a science rather than an art. In general terms, systems analysis is defined as the collection, organization, and evaluation of facts about a system and its environment. In terms of information systems, systems analysis occupies the first two steps of the system development cycle [2]:

1. Documentation of the existing system
2. Analysis of the system requirements to produce the logical design (program module and file structures) of an improved system.

However, we have never developed a formal theory of systems analysis, particularly with regard to the analysis of system requirements. Young and Kent [10] made a most remarkable first step toward developing such a theory by identifying the basic components of a data processing problem:

- Information sets
- Documents
- Relationships among information sets
- Operational requirements.

However, their effort stopped short of specifying what analysis must be performed upon the system requirements in order to verify their consistency, completeness, and accuracy. Furthermore, as in the case of Information Algebra [11], no approach to the production of a logical system design is apparent.

Other investigators, Teichroew [25] in particular, have suggested specifications for the analysis of system requirements. However, these specifications are described in a narrative manner and therefore, they lack the rigor that has been claimed to be necessary for the specification of system requirements. In other words, we should comply with our recognized standards and impose the discipline of requirements statement upon requirements statement analysis itself. Therefore, the development of a formal theory of systems analysis is imperative. The need for formalism is recognized by Wrigley [26]. Such a theory should provide the criteria for requirements statement facilities and for the logical capabilities of requirements statement analysis. Furthermore, the theory should include a formal model of an information system that...
represents a canonical form of all alternative
designs that satisfy system requirements. Although
this theory is motivated by the needs of automatic
programming, the theory should be equally applicable
to software development by traditional manual
methods.

The criteria for requirements statement facilities
should address several central issues. In particular,
problems in requirements statement are still evident in the expression of:
1. Logical data structures and their
Identifiers
2. Time and volume parameters
3. Processing and logic

The criteria for the logical capabilities of
requirements statement analysis should specify the
logical conditions that the requirements statement
should satisfy and the reports that can be
compiled from the requirements statement to aid
system design. Furthermore, the model can also be
the vehicle for the description of algorithms for
generating logical design specifications for program
modules and files.

Therefore, we develop a formal model of an
information system. In particular, note that the
formal model provides the underlying structure for
specification of a Requirements Statement Language
and its analysis, and is not the RSL itself. Al-
though the algebraic notation of the model may be
lengthy and detailed, it is essential to apply the
rigor of mathematics to the definition of requirements
statement and its analysis. The set-theoretic
approach has the advantage of notation and
precision of the mathematical
approach insures the desired explicitness achieved
by the model.

PRISM: PROPERTIES OF AN INFORMATION SYSTEM
MODEL

Definitions:

Let R be the set of all number and charac-
ter representations. Let U = {d_i} be the data
names in the information system being modeled by
PRISM. Let a data item be the ordered pair
<d_i, r>, where d_i is a name and r is an occurrence of
the data name d_i with value v.

A relational structure D_h is a set of data names. Let D = (D_h) be the n
set of relational structures of the information system
being modeled by PRISM. Let P be the set of sub-
scripts of the data names in D_h. Then, D_h =
{d_i : i E P}.

The components of a relational structure D_h are:
- D_h = \{d_i \in D_h : d_i \in D\}
- R_h = \{r \in R : r \in D\}

A data base DB is a set of occurrences of
relational structures. Let \( \theta = \{d_i : r \} \) be an occurrence of a relational
structure D_h. Then, \( \theta \in \text{occ} \). The set of occurrences of D_h in DB
is \( \text{occ} \theta \).

The subsctipts h,j correspond to a data-base-key
that enables the location of any occurrence in DB.

The identifier set ID_h of a relational structure D_h is a subset of the data names in D_h with
the following properties:

1. \( \text{ID}_h(0) = \{d_i : r \in \Theta \} \) is the occurrence of \( \text{ID}_h \) for 0.
2. \( \text{K}_h = \{\text{ID}_h(a) : a \in \text{occ}_h \} \) is the set of all occurrences of \( \text{ID}_h \) in DB.
3. If \( \text{ID}_h \subseteq \text{ID}_h \), \( F \) is a mapping from \( \text{OC}_h \) to \( \text{OC}_h \), which to every element \( \text{oc}_h, j \in \text{OC}_h \) associates an element \( \text{oc}_h, j \in \text{OC}_h \). Let \( \text{occ}_h \) be an occurrence of the relational structure \( \text{D}_h \).
4. \( F \) is one-one if whenever \( \text{oc}_h, i \) and \( \text{oc}_h, j \) are elements of \( \text{OC}_h \) and
\( \text{oc}_h, i \neq \text{oc}_h, j \) then \( F(\text{oc}_h, i) \neq F(\text{oc}_h, j) \).
5. \( F \) maps \( \text{OC}_h \) onto \( \text{OC}_h \), so if \( \text{oc}_h, j \), \( \text{oc}_h, j' \)
\( \in \text{OC}_h \) and \( F(\text{oc}_h, j) = \text{oc}_h, j' \).

PRISM: PROPERTIES OF AN INFORMATION SYSTEM
MODEL

The data names that belong to the identifier set
are underlined in the definition of the relational
structure. Let \( \text{ID}_h \) be the set of subscripts of the
data names in the identifier set of \( \text{D}_h \). Then,
\( \text{ID}_h = \{d_i : i \in \text{P} \} \) is the identifier set of \( \text{D}_h \).

The identifier set \( \text{ID}_h \) is also a relational structure and
could be its own identifier set.

These definitions are illustrated in an
example presented later in this paper.

Let \( k \in K_h \) and \( k' \in K_h \). If \( k \) is
projected equivalent to \( k' \), then \( k \) is
projection equivalent to \( k' \).

Let \( F \) be a function from \( k \) to \( k' \).

If \( F \) is a function from \( k \) to \( k' \), then
\( F \) is a function from \( k \) to \( k' \).

Let \( A = \{N, \text{I}, \text{C}, \text{H} \} \) and \( \text{ID}_h \) be a subset of the data names in \( \text{ID}_h \). Then,
\( \text{ID}_h = \{d_i : i \in \text{P} \} \) is the identifier set of \( \text{D}_h \).

The identifier set \( \text{ID}_h \) is also a relational structure and
could be its own identifier set.

These definitions are illustrated in an
example presented later in this paper.

Let \( k \in K_h \) and \( k' \in K_h \). If \( k \) is
projected equivalent to \( k' \), then \( k \) is
projection equivalent to \( k' \).

Let \( F \) be a function from \( k \) to \( k' \).

If \( F \) is a function from \( k \) to \( k' \), then
\( F \) is a function from \( k \) to \( k' \).

Let \( A = \{N, \text{I}, \text{C}, \text{H} \} \) and \( \text{ID}_h \) be a subset of the data names in \( \text{ID}_h \). Then,
\( \text{ID}_h = \{d_i : i \in \text{P} \} \) is the identifier set of \( \text{D}_h \).

The identifier set \( \text{ID}_h \) is also a relational structure and
could be its own identifier set.

These definitions are illustrated in an
example presented later in this paper.
items occurring on the document belong to relational structures containing different identifier sets. For example, a report may contain both a listing of individual employee wages identified by employee number and of departmental wage totals identified by department number.

The states 1 and H are not partitioned because designation of the contents of physical input documents and consolidation of history data items into files assigned to physical devices are activities of system design (whether manual or computer-aided) and not of requirements statement. Logical definition of a single input or history data set (set of data names) is accomplished by including logically-related data names in one relational structure. Hence, membership of an input or history data name in a relational structure indicates the logical data set to which the name belongs.

Each computational result data item, i.e., an occurrence in state C, belongs to only one relational structure. Hence, membership of a computational result data name in a relational structure indicates the computation to which the name belongs, thereby making it unnecessary to partition the state C. A cycle containing a computational result data name is not initially defined by the problem definer, but is instead created during requirements statement as an implicit structure containing the data name of the computational result as the only member of the structure that is not in the identifier set.

Let T = {1, 2, ...} be the set of days corresponding to the dates beginning with January 1, 1970. Processing is cyclical. Therefore, time is measured in terms of cycles:

1. Time of initiation of cycle: \( t_1 \)
2. Length of cycle (in days): \( L \)
3. Cycle number: \( n \)

\[ t_{n+1} = t_n + 1; \] cycle number \( n \) happens at time \( t_n \in T \). Cycle number \( 0 \) represents creation of history relational structures.

Define \( T(t_1, t_n) : n \rightarrow T \) as the function which calculates the time of happening of any cycle iteration:

\[ T(t_{1,n}) = t_1 + (n-1)L \] for \( n \geq 1 \).

Define \( h \) as the proportion of happenings of the cycle of relational structure \( D_h \) to happenings of the cycle of \( D_h' \). For example, if \( D_h \) is an input relational structure for a biweekly pay check, \( h \), is an output relational structure for a biweekly pay check, \( p_{h,h'} = 14 \) (ratio of 14 happenings of a daily cycle in the two-week period of a biweekly cycle.)

The cycle of a relational structure is characterized by the cycle of the data item in that structure with the smallest cycle length. The happening of the cycle of a history relational structure represents the reading or writing of occurrences of that structure. The happening of the cycle of an input/output relational structure represents the reading or writing of occurrences of that structure. All items in a single input/output relational structure must have the same cycle. The happening of the cycle of a computational result relational structure represents the execution of the corresponding computation.

Let \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) \) represent the state of data name \( d_i \in D_h \) in the \( n \)th happening of the cycle of length \( L \) beginning at time \( t_1 \in T \).

1. \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) = 1 \) represents input of the value of the data name \( d_i \) in the \( n \)th happening of the cycle of length \( L \) beginning at time \( t_1 \).

2. \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) = C \) represents computation of the value of data name \( d_i \) in the \( n \)th happening of the cycle of length \( L \) beginning at time \( t_1 \).

3. \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) = H \) represents storage of the value of data name \( d_i \) in the \( n \)th happening of the cycle of length \( L \) beginning at time \( t_1 \).

The state of a data item in any particular cycle implies nothing about the state of that data item in any other cycle.

For example, a report may contain both a listing of individual employee wages identified by employee number and of departmental wage totals identified by department number. Processing is cyclical. Therefore, time is measured in terms of cycles:

1. Time of initiation of cycle: \( t_1 \)
2. Length of cycle (in days): \( L \)
3. Cycle number: \( n \)

4. Unique correspondence: \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) \) only relates to \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) \) if and only if \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) \) is related to \( s_{i,h,j}(t_{1,n}) \).
The requirelDenu statement technique. The avail­
ures of each type are cons trueted from other
ures include:

1. Erroneous transactions
\( \{ h, j \in OC_h : \text{ID}_h (\text{OC}_h, j) \in \} \)
\( \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) - \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \) is the set of
occurrences of \( D_h \) for which there exist
no equivalent identifier set occurrences
in \( \text{OC}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \).

2. Valid transactions
\( \{ h, j \in OC_h : \text{ID}_h (\text{OC}_h, j) \in \} \)
\( \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \cap \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \) is the set of
occurrences of \( D_h \) for which there exist
no equivalent identifier set occurrences
in \( \text{OC}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \).

3. Inactive master records
\( \{ h, j \in OC_h : \text{ID}_h (\text{OC}_h, j) \in \} \)
\( \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) - \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \) is the set of
occurrences of \( D_h \) for which there exist
no equivalent identifier set occurrences
in \( \text{OC}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \).

4. Active master records
\( \{ h, j \in OC_h : \text{ID}_h (\text{OC}_h, j) \in \} \)
\( \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \cap \text{K}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \) is the set of
occurrences of \( D_h \) for which there exist
no equivalent identifier set occurrences
in \( \text{OC}_h (t_{i, j, n}) \).

At first, it may appear that the relational
structure defined in PRISM does not possess suffic­
ient generality for the expression of more complex
data structures. However, a description of the
data structure class for requirements statement and a demonstration of the relational structure's capability to represent the data structure class
should serve to establish the generality of the
relational structure. The advantage of the re­
lational structure lies in its ability to enable the
simple specification of the relations among
data without necessitating specification of the
complex data structures representing those rela­
tions. Therefore, the structure of the data base is
not fixed during requirements statement, but
instead the automatic programming software con­
structs the data base by aggregating the relational
structures.

THE DATA STRUCTURE CLASS

The types of structures available to the
problem definer and the manner in which structures
of each type are constructed from other
structures describe the data structure class of
the requirements statement technique. The avail­
able structure types and their component structures include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Component Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>item, group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group relation</td>
<td>group, group relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>record, group relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item:
The elementary data structure is the item.
The item is the smallest structural unit from
which all available structure types are ultimately
constructed.

Group:
A group is a collection of items or other
groups. A simple group is a collection of items
only while a compound group is a collection of both
items and groups.

A simple group can be used in two ways. One,
it can be defined as a collection of items in order
to give the collection a name and other attributes of
its own. An example is the group EMPLOYER com­
posed of the items NAME, SOCIAL-SECURITY-NUMBER,
WAGE-STATUS and RATE. Also, the items CHILD-NAME
and AGE form the simple group OFFSPRING. Second, a
simple group can be defined as a collection of
string-valued items having a "collective value"
formed by concatenating the string-valued item com­
ponents. For example, the items MONTH, DAY, and
YEAR form the group DATE-OF-HIRE.

A compound group is a collection of a set of
items, called principal items, and a set of groups,
called principal groups, with this new collection
having a name and other attributes of its own. For
example, if the groups DATE-OF-HIRE and OFFSPRING
are added to the simple group EMPLOYEE, the result
is a new compound group EMPLOYEE consisting of the
items NAME, SOCIAL-SECURITY-NUMBER, WAGE-STATUS,
and RATE and the simple groups DATE-OF-HIRE and
OFFSPRING.

A group may be either repeating or non-repeat­
ing. A repeating group may have an arbitrary num­
ber of occurrences for each occurrence of the com­
 pound group containing the repeating group. A non­
 repeating group has only one occurrence for each
occurrence of the containing compound group. For
example, OFFSPRING is a repeating group because the
number of children can vary from employee to
employee. However, DATE-OF-HIRE is a non-repeating
group because each employee has only one hiring
data.

Group Relation:
A group relation is a mapping between two sets
of groups. The groups belonging to the first set
are called parent groups and those belonging to the
second set are called dependent groups.

The group relation provides a way to relating
groups. For example, with a set of parent PERSON
group occurrences:
\( \{ \text{PERSON} (\text{JOHN DOE}), \text{PERSON} (\text{J. SMITH}) \} \)
and with a set of dependent SKILL group occur­
cences:
\( \{ \text{SKILL}(1000), \text{SKILL}(2000), \text{SKILL}(3000), \text{SKILL}(4000) \} \)
a group relation can be created to relate each
person to the skill(s) he possesses:
\( \{ \text{PERSON} (\text{JOHN DOE}), \text{SKILL}(3000) \} \)
\( \{ \text{PERSON} (\text{J. SMITH}), \text{SKILL}(2000) \} \)
\( \{ \text{PERSON} (\text{J. SMITH}), \text{SKILL}(3000) \} \)

Also, the group relation provides a way to
establish a hierarchic relation between two sets of
items. In a hierarchic group relation, each occur­
rrence of a dependent group must be subordinate to
one and only one occurrence of a parent group; the
dependent group occurrence cannot stand alone. An
example of a hierarchic group relation associates
a parent group occurrence representing a person
with a set of dependent group occurrences.
representing the academic degrees he holds:

PERSON (JOHN DOE), DEGREE (BS, 1970, PURDUE)
PERSON (JOHN DOE), DEGREE (MS, 1971, PURDUE)

Generally, a hierarchic group relation is equivalent to a compound group. However, in a compound group, the principal items do not have a collective name. The compound group name refers to the entire collection of principal items and principal groups. In a group relation, each parent group has its own name.

An occurrence of a group relation consists of one or more occurrences of each parent and dependent group, with each parent group occurrence associated with one or more dependent group occurrences. If the group relation is non-hierarchic, each dependent group occurrence may be optionally associated with one or more parent group occurrences. If the group relation is hierarchic, each dependent group occurrence must be associated with one and only one parent group occurrence.

In a manner analogous to compound groups, a dependent group in a group relation may be repeating or non-repeating. A repeating dependent group has a variable number of occurrences for each occurrence of its parent group; a non-repeating dependent group has only one occurrence for each occurrence of its parent group.

Record:
A record is a collection of groups and group relations in which one and only one group, the record-defining group, is not subordinate to any other group. The record is used to define the major entities of an application. For a given class of entities, e.g. the employees of a firm, the principal items in the record-defining group correspond to fixed entity attributes of all entities in the given class. The items in the principal group contained in the record-defining group or in the dependent group subordinate to the record-defining group correspond to variable entity attributes. Variable entity attributes either have multiple values or are not necessarily common to all entities in the given class.

The record-defining group may not be the dependent group in a hierarchic group relation contained in the record. However, the record-defining group may be the dependent group in a non-hierarchic group relation that relates records in the same file. A later discussion of the file describes inter-record relations.

There are three record types: the group record, the tree record, and theplex record. Each record type is a generalization of the former type so that a special case of each type is identical to the former type.

A group record is a single compound group. The compound group is the record-defining group. A tree record is a set of hierarchic group relations arranged as a tree so that each group has at most one parent, and that one and only one group, the record-defining group, has no parent.

A plex record is a set of group relations in which each group except the record-defining group is the dependent group in a hierarchic group relation. In addition, all groups in a plex record may occur in any number of non-hierarchic group relations.

File:
A file is a collection of records. Hence, a file represents a collection of application entities, e.g. employees, projects, or parts. The entities represented by a file may belong to the same class, e.g. employees of a firm, or to different classes, e.g. projects and the parts used in each project.

In the sense that one record of a file can be processed without referencing another record in the same file, the records of a file are independent of one another. However, the records in a file may be explicitly inter-related in a manner apparent to the system. For example, the records in a file may be ordered on the value of the record sequencer, a set of items contained in the record. A file with unrelated records or with records related only by ordering is called an unlinked file. In addition, more general relations are possible by permitting non-hierarchic group relations between groups in different records. A file containing records participating in these more general explicit relations is called a linked file. Of course, the records in a linked file may also be ordered.

Data Base:
A data base is a set of files.

A Relational Model of Data:
A relational model for large data bases is described by Codd [27 and 28]. The relational model uses tables for representing the logical data base structure. A table is a rectangular array with the following properties:

P1: a table is column-homogeneous, i.e. all the items in any single column are of the same type, but items in different columns are not necessarily of the same type.
P2: each item in a table is either a number or a character string.
P3: all rows of a table are distinct.
P4: the ordering of rows in a table is immaterial.
P5: the columns in a table are assigned distinct names and the ordering of columns in a table is immaterial.

As a result, a table represents a relation of degree n, where n is the number of columns in the table. An example of a relation of degree 3 is the relation COMPONENT. The triple (x, y, z) belongs to this relation if the part with part number x is a component of the part with part number y and if z units of part x are needed to construct one unit of part y:

COMPONENT
(SUB-PART-NO, SUP-PART-NO, QUANTITY)

| 2010 | 6020 | 2 |
| 2015 | 6020 | 1 |
| 2025 | 6030 | 5 |
| 3010 | 6030 | 3 |
| 3025 | 6030 | 5 |

We now demonstrate that the relational model possesses capability to represent the three types of records described earlier. Hence, in addition to its comprehensibility, the relational model also possesses flexibility.

Tabular Representation of Group Records:
Consider the example of a group record, called EMPLOYEE described earlier. The elimination of the principal groups DATE-OF-HIRE (non-repeating) and OFFSPRING (repeating) is accomplished with three
separate relations. These three relations convey all the information contained in the group record because the item SOCIAL-SECURITY-NUMBER uniquely identifies each EMPLOYEE and the item CHILD-NAME uniquely identifies the children of each EMPLOYEE:

- EMPLOYEE(NAME, SOCIAL-SECURITY-NUMBER, WAGE-STATUS, RATE, DATE-OF-HIRE(SOCIAL-SECURITY-NUMBER, MONTH, DAY, YEAR), OFFSPRING(SOCIAL-SECURITY-NUMBER, CHILD-NAME, AGE)).

Tabular Representation of Tree Records:

Consider the example of a tree record called PERSON:

- PERSON (parent of SKILL group and CHILD group)
  - NAME
  - NUMBER
  - SALARY
  - SKILL
    - CODE
    - TITLE
  - CHILD (parent of PET group)
    - CHILD-NAME
    - AGE
    - PET
    - TYPE
    - PET-NAME

Although identical to a group record, the tree record PERSON differs from the group record in addressability: an occurrence of the group record must be retrieved as a complete unit, but certain portions, e.g., the SKILL group, of an occurrence of the tree record can be retrieved without retrieving the entire tree record occurrence. Assuming that the following items uniquely identify the corresponding groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILL</td>
<td>CHILD-NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET-NAME</td>
<td>PET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elimination of the group structures yields the following relations:

- PERSON(NAME, NUMBER, SALARY)
- SKILL(NUMBER, CODE, TITLE)
- CHILD(NUMBER, CHILD-NAME, AGE)
- PET(NUMBER, CHILD-NAME, PET-NAME, TYPE)

Tabular Representation of Plex Records:

Consider an example of a plex record describing relationships between suppliers and parts. The parent group SUPPLIER consists of two items:

- SUPPLIER-NO and SUPPLIER-DESC. The dependent group PART consists of three items: PART-NO, PART-DESC, and QUANTITY. Two relationships between SUPPLIER x and PART y exist: the CANDIDATE relationship holds if x is capable of supplying y; the ACTUAL relationship holds if x actually supplies y. Assuming that SUPPLIER-NO uniquely identifies each SUPPLIER and that PART-NO uniquely identifies each PART, four relations represent both groups and the two relationships between the groups:

- SUPPLIER(SUPPLIER-NO, SUPPLIER-DESC)
- PART(PART-NO, PART-DESC, QUANTITY)
- CANDIDATE(SUPPLIER-NO, PART-NO)
- ACTUAL(SUPPLIER-NO, PART-NO).

PRISM Language Constructs:

PRISM statements are assignment statements that set the value of either a state variable $s, h, j(t, i, n)$ or a value variable $v, h, j(t, i, n)$. A state variable is set by either another state variable or one of the states defined in PRISM. A value variable is set by a value expression consisting of decimal numbers, other value variables, arithmetic operators, and logical conditions. A logical condition, enclosed in parentheses and appearing in a value expression, has the following semantics:

$$\text{(logical-condition) = } \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1 & \text{if true} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$  

Such a logical condition is used for the specification of logic in the statement of computational requirements.

In addition to the use of logical conditions within value expressions, logical conditions may appear in the context of conditional assignment statements. A logical condition, enclosed in braces, is called a defining condition and has the following semantics:

$$\{ \text{logical} \} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{defined} & \text{if true} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$ 

Then, the defining condition is applied to an assignment statement with the following semantics:

- $\{ \text{assignment} \}$: defined means $\{ \text{assignment} \}$ is performed.
- $\{ \text{assignment} \}$: undefined means $\{ \text{assignment} \}$ is not performed.

The defining condition is generally used for the specification of the state of data name appearing in an assignment and for the matching of identifier sets whose relational structures are involved in an assignment.

AN EXAMPLE:

For purposes of illustration, we describe a payroll application which will illustrate the principles to be presented in the remainder of this paper. Biweekly, a PAY-REPORT listing the Social Security number, name, and wages of each employee is produced. Biweekly, each employee submits a TIME-CARD containing his Social Security number, date of pay, and hours worked. An employee history EMP is maintained to store the Social Security number, name, wage status, rate of pay, and year-to-date wages of each employee. Modifications to the history are entered on a maintenance document called EMP-UPDATE.

Initial definition of the example consists of the following PRISM definitions:

- PAY-REPORT = (SSN NAME WAGES).
- TIME-CARD = (SSN DATE HOURS).
- EMP = (SSN NAME WAGE-STATUS RATE YTD-WAGES).

File creation:

- $d \in \text{TIME-CARD} \quad \forall j \in C \text{TIME-CARD}(4,14,n)$
- $d \in \text{TIME-CARD} \quad j(4,14,n) = 1$
- $d \in \text{TIME-CARD} \quad j(4,14,0) = 0$
- $d \in \text{PAY-REPORT} \quad j(4,14,n) = 1$
- $d \in \text{PAY-REPORT} \quad j(4,14,0) = 0$
- $d \in \text{EMP-UPDATE} \quad j(4,14,n) = 1$
- $d \in \text{EMP-UPDATE} \quad j(4,14,0) = 0$

PRISM statements are assignment statements.
FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR REQUIREMENTS STATEMENT ANALYSIS:

Functional specifications for requirements statement analysis describe the logical capabilities of an RSA. These capabilities include the performance of two functions:

1. Verification of logical conditions in the RSL statement.
2. Production of reports from the RSL statement to aid system design.

Logical conditions that must be satisfied by the requirements statement include:

A. Data definition and static analysis:

1. Identifier set membership:
   a. Equivalent identifier sets: matching two relational structures with equivalent occurrences of identifier sets requires that the two relational structures have equivalent identifier sets.
   b. Projected equivalent identifier sets: matching two relational structures with projected equivalent occurrences of identifier sets requires that the identifier set of the second relational structure is contained in that of the first.
   c. Function equivalent identifier sets: matching two relational structures with function equivalent occurrences of identifier sets requires that there exists a function that maps the occurrences of the identifier set of the first relational structure to those of the second.

2. History update: each non-identifier history data item must be updated by some input or computational data item.

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \in \text{NAME, WAGE-STATUS, RATE} \quad \forall n \geq 0 \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL} \quad \exists \text{i, j} \leq \text{EMPL} \\
\text{V} \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n+1) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n+1) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n+1) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n+1) \\
\end{align*}
\]

3. Output source of information: each output data item must have a source of information which is either an input, computation, or history data item whose time of happening is no later than that of the output data item.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\end{align*}
\]

4. No unnecessary input: each input data item must ultimately be used as the source of information for either an output or history data item or for an operand of a computational data item whose time of happening is no sooner than that of the input data item.

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\text{V} & \in \text{EMPL}_i, \text{EMPL}_j(4,14,n) + \text{EMPL}_i(4,14,n) \\
\end{align*}
\]
Example:  

\[ T_{h} = T \] (4,14,n) = T(4,14,n)  

5. No redundant input: in any particular processing cycle, each non-identifier input data item should be defined only once.  

\[ \forall s_{i,h,j}(t_{1},t_{n}) = 1 \land d_{i} \not\in ID_{h} \]  

6. No redundant history: in any particular processing cycle, each non-identifier history data item should be defined only once.  

\[ \forall s_{i,h,j}(t_{1},t_{n}) = 1 \land d_{i} \not\in ID_{h} \]  

7. Output data item cannot be used as an information source: When \( v_{i,h,j}(t_{1},t_{n}) \) appears on the right-hand side of an assignment, there does not exist a defining condition in the same assignment of the form: \( v_{s_{i,h,j}}(t_{1},t_{n}) = 0 \).  

B. Dynamic analysis  

1. In any input or output relational structure, all data names in the same structure must have the same cycle.  

2. For each output data item, the cycle of each input or computation source of information must be equal to the cycle of the output data item.  

3. For each history data item, the cycle of each input or computation source of information must be equal to the cycle of the history data item.  

4. For each computation data item, the cycle of each input or computation source of information must be equal to the cycle of the computation data item.  

Reports produced during requirements statement analysis include the following:  

A. Data definition and static analysis  

1. Specification of correspondence and unique correspondence relations between occurrences of relational structures.  

Example:  

\[ \text{OC}_{\text{EMPL-UPDATE}}(4,14,n) \sim \text{OC}_{\text{EMPL}}(4,14,n) \]  

\[ \forall n \geq 0 \]  

\[ \text{OC}_{\text{PAY-REPORT}}(4,14,n) \sim \text{OC}_{\text{PAY-REPORT}}(4,14,n) \]  

\[ \forall n \geq 1 \]  

2. Incidence matrix: \( (I_{h}) \) identifies the data names \( d_{i} \) used to define each computational relational structure \( D_{h} \).  

For \( (i_{h},(t_{1},t_{n})): d_{i} \in D_{h} \), at \( T(t_{1},t_{n}) \) and \( (h(t_{1},t_{n})): s_{k,h,j}(t_{1},t_{n}) = c \)  

where \( d_{k} \in D_{h} \) and \( d_{k} \not\in ID_{h} \):  

\[ I_{i_{h}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_{i} \text{ is an operand in the computation of } d_{k} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]  

Example:  

\[ \text{COMPUTE-MAGE} = (\text{SSN NAGES}) \]  

\[ \text{UPDATE} = (\text{SSN YTD-NAGES}) \]  

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} \text{COMPUTE-MAGE}(4,14,n) & \text{UPDATE}(4,14,n) \\ \hline \text{HOURS}(4,14,n) & 1 & 0 \\ \text{RATE}(4,14,n) & 1 & 0 \\ \text{WAGES}(4,14,n) & -1 & 1 \\ \text{YTD-WAGES}(4,14,n) & 0 & 1 \\ \text{YTD-WAGES}(4,14,n) & 0 & -1 \\ \end{array} \]  

3. Precedence matrix: \( (P_{i_{h}}) \) indicates the data names \( d_{i} \) that must be available before each computational data name \( d_{k} \) can be computed.  

For \( (i_{h},(t_{1},t_{n})): d_{i} \in D_{h} \), at \( T(t_{1},t_{n}) \) and \( (k(t_{1},t_{n})): s_{k,h,j}(t_{1},t_{n}) = c \)  

where \( d_{k} \in D_{h} \) and \( d_{k} \not\in ID_{h} \):  

\[ P_{i_{h}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_{i} \text{ is an operand in the computation of } d_{k} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]  

Example:  

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c} \text{COMPUTE-MAGE}(4,14,n) & \text{YTD-WAGES}(4,14,n) \\ \hline \text{HOURS}(4,14,n) & 0 & 1 \\ \text{RATE}(4,14,n) & 1 & 0 \\ \text{WAGES}(4,14,n) & 0 & 1 \\ \text{YTD-WAGES}(4,14,n) & 0 & 1 \\ \end{array} \]
INCLUSION

The criteria for language facilities of an RSL and for logical capabilities of an RSA are specified via the vehicle of a formal system. Most of the criteria for logical capabilities of an RSA are specified by an implementation of an RSA for ADS developed at the University of Michigan [29] and extended at Purdue University [20].
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