

Refactoring, Serialization, and Version Hell

Michael Stiefel

co-author Application Development Using C# and .NET



www.reliablesoftware.com
development@reliablesoftware.com

Goal: Reproducible Deployment

- Avoid “DLL Hell”
- Every installation has the same result
- Every uninstall is a complete removal
- Model: Install/Uninstall of a Compact Disc
- Allow side-by-side execution
- Test What You Ship
- Deterministic

The Problem

- Deterministic Deployment requires Unique Identifiers (Strong Names)
- Strongly Named Assemblies must reference Strongly Named Assemblies
- Types are Assembly Relative
- Assemblies reference an assembly with a particular identity.

Assemblies Need Unique Identifiers

- Application “Bill of Materials”
- Determine What is Missing
- *No Unique Id Example*
 - Not deterministic

Unique Ids Require Strong Names

- Cryptographically Unique Name
 - public / private key
- Incorporate Version
 - allow versioning of assemblies
- Incorporate Culture
- *Name-version-culture-public key*
- Placed in Assembly Manifest

Assemblies Referenced By Unique Id

- Public Key or Public Key Token of referenced assembly
 - Public Key Token is lowest 8 bytes of SHA1 hash of public key
 - more compact than public key
- Placed in referencing assembly at compile time
- *Unique Id Example*
 - deterministic

Note: Technically Optional

“A conforming implementation of the CLI need not perform this validation, but it is permitted to do so, and it may refuse to load an assembly for which the validation fails. A conforming implementation of the CLI may also refuse to permit access to an assembly unless the assembly reference contains either the public key or the public key token. A conforming implementation of the CLI shall make the same access decision independent of whether a public key or a token is used.”

Common Language Infrastructure
Partition II: Metadata Definition and Semantics
Section 6.3

Determinism Must Propagate

- Strongly named assemblies must call into strongly named assemblies
 - Keeps determinism from the perspective of the caller
 - *Strongly Named Reference Example*

Type is Assembly Relative

- Different Names Changes the Type
 - *Almost Identical Example*
- Versioning an Assembly Changes the Type
 - *Types Example*

Implications ...

Version Compatibility

- Specified by version binding policy in the application's configuration file.
- Policy allows administrators to configure applications without recompilation.
 - Security Policy
 - Version Binding Policy
 - Remoting Configuration

Version Policy

- Can indicate version equivalences for application

...

```
<assemblyBinding xmlns="urn:schemas-microsoft-com:asm.v1">  
  <publisherPolicy apply = "yes" />  
  <dependentAssembly>  
    <assemblyIdentity name="Customer" publicKeyToken="f95c9298a3bfb06b" />  
    <bindingRedirect oldVersion="1.0.0.0-1.2.0.0" newVersion="1.2.0.0" />  
  </dependentAssembly>  
</assemblyBinding>
```

...

- *Version Policy Example*

Publisher Policy

- Can specify equivalent versions
 - for major.minor version
- Can be turned off in application configuration file for entire application
- Insure critical fixes get to all applications
- Not for upgrades
- *Publisher Policy example*

Machine Policy

- Machine.config can have version policy set by administrators
- Policy resolution order: app, publisher, admin

Policy Hell

- Policy complicates a programmer's life.
- Policy simplifies an administrator's life.
 - Eases application replacement
 - Precise bug fix releases
- Version Hell is an example of Policy Hell.
- Get used to it!
 - The world does not revolve around programmers.
 - Would be easier with better tool support for rebinding or source code control integration.

Assembly Granularity

More precise releases

Emergency fixes

Security fixes

Easier to Find problems

Quicker development build cycle

vs.

Management of many assemblies

Dependencies

- Within Assembly Dependencies OK
- Minimize Dependencies Among Assemblies
- Consider Assembly Dependencies as well as Class Dependencies

Refactoring

“the process of changing a software system in such a way that it does not alter the external behavior of the code yet improves its internal structure.”

Martin Fowler

Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code

Logical vs. Physical Design

- Distinguish Logical and Physical Design
- Logical design = class design
 - Keep software evolvable
- Physical design = class distribution among assemblies
 - Allow more precise upgrades
 - Distributing classes among assemblies is not enough
- *Physical Design Example*

Logical Dependencies

- Interfaces help decouple logical dependencies.
- Design Patterns help decouple logical dependencies.
- Still have to think carefully.
 - *Physical Design Example Step 5*
 - *Upside Down Example*

When to Version?

- Do release, then bump version number, clearer when QA, users report mistakes.
- Change only when assembly changes
- Deploy changed assembly and revised version file.
 - use side by side deployment (Codebase, GAC)
 - revert to previous versions through policy
- XCopy deployment to track different customer deployments

Refactoring Physical Design

- *Moving Types example*
- Version, rebuild affected assemblies
- Dynamic load produces complications

Refactoring and Saved Data

- *Serialization Example*
- **SerializationBinder** to redirect type
 - Changed Assembly version
 - Type moved to different assembly
 - Type no longer exists
- **IDeserializationCallback**
 - data moved to different classes

Class Versioning

- No direct relationship between assembly versioning and class changes.
 - Multiple versions can correspond to a single class version (algorithmic changes)
 - Multiple classes can exist in an assembly
 - Person who versions assemblies may not be the person who modifies a class

Summary

- Goal : Reproducible install / uninstall
- Components must be uniquely identifiable
- Policy drives version compatibility
- Physical as well as Logical Design matters