

#### Getting Continuous Testing Done Right with CD-Linter

**Carmine Vassallo** University of Zurich

DevOps Institute, Continuous Testing SKILup Day, November 19, 2020





### Who Am I

#### My name is **Carmine Vassallo**

Research intern in the Continuous Delivery team at ING Nederland (2015)

PhD Graduate from the University of Zurich (2020), where I am currently a postdoctoral researcher

My research goal is to facilitate the adoption of **DevOps** practices



# I'm on the Job Market!



http://tiny.uzh.ch/WV







#### **Continuous Testing is a foundation of Continuous Delivery** (Humble et Farley, 2010)





### Continuous Delivery (CD)



**Release Candidate** 

stages:

- compilation
- testing

- qa

variables: POSTGRES\_USR: user POSTGRES\_PWD: password

compile\_production\_code: stage: compile script: "mvn compile" when: manual allow\_failure: false

compile\_test\_code: stage: compilation script: "mvn test" retry: 3

• • •

.gitlab-ci.yml



Icons from https://vitalitychicago.com/blog/top-reasons-agile-didnt-work-for-us-1-we-couldnt-co-locate-teams/ www.flaticon.com/authors/roundicons, https://www.pinclipart.com/pindetail/hbTb\_clipart-info-server-png-transpa

### Continuous Delivery (CD)



Commit (often)



### **Developers struggle configuring build pipelines**







- compilation
- testing

qa \_

variables: POSTGRES\_USR: user **POSTGRES** PWD: password

(Hilton et al., 2017)

	comp
Release Candidate	sta
	SCI
	ret

oile\_test\_code: age: compilation ript: "mvn test" try: 3

.gitlab-ci.yml







### Linters for CD Configurations

#### SLIC (Rahman et al., 2019)



Security smell: hard-coded secrets.

#### CI Lint (GitLab)



Syntax is incorrect: chosen stage does not exist.

#### Hansel (Gallaba et al., 2018)

CD feature is misused: command unrelated to the stage.







## Linters for CD Configurations

SLIC (Rahman et al., 2019)

**Security smell:** hard-coded secrets.

### Developers typically lack awareness of CD principle (e.g., Continuous Testing) violations that threaten expected benefits (Vassallo et al., 2019)

**CD** feature is misused: command unrelated to the stage.





stage: compilation

script: "mvn test"

retry: 3

. . .

.gitlab-ci.yml







## CD-Linter: Detecting violations of CD principles



**Fake Success** 

**Retry Failure** 



Carmine Vassallo, Sebastian Proksch, Anna Jancso, Harald C. Gall, Massimiliano Di Penta. Configuration Smells in Continuous Delivery Pipelines: A Linter and A Six-Month Study on GitLab. In ESEC/FSE, 2020.



#### **Manual Execution**

**Fuzzy Version** 

### Fake Success



#### Prevent job failures from failing the build







### Retry Failure

## The build process has to be deterministic











### Manual Execution

## The pipeline has to be fully automated









### Fuzzy Version



#### Do not specify the exact version of dependencies









### Evaluation of CD-Linter

**RQ1**: Are the CD Smells Detected by CD-Linter Relevant to Developers?

**RQ2**: How Accurate Is CD-Linter?

**RQ3**: How Frequent Are the Investigated CD Smells in Practice?







### Empirical Study





#### **RQ1: Relevance of CD Smells**



6-month monitoring of states, comments, and fixes



64 Developers (Resp. rate: 74%)

145 (86) Issues

**↓●**≣′

#### **RQ2: Accuracy of CD-Linter**





2 validators ("k" agreement: 0.76)

868 Config. files

#### **RQ3: Frequency of CD smells**

Icons from: https://www.flaticon.com/authors/freepik

### Empirical Study





#### **RQ1: Relevance of CD Smells**



6-month monitoring of states, comments, and fixes



64 Developers (Resp. rate: 74%)

145 (86) Issues

(●≣′

**RQ2: Accuracy of CD-Linter** 





2 validators ("k" agreement: 0.76)

868 Config. files

#### **RQ3: Frequency of CD smells**

Icons from: https://www.flaticon.com/authors/freepik

### RQ 1: GitLab issues reporting CD smells



https://gitlab.com/bitseater/meteo/blob/master/.gitlab-ci.yml#L107



GitLab config: Failures in job 'package:snap' cannot fail the build

To fully benefit from the advantages of CI/CD, developers need to follow certain principles. Many of these principles have been introduced in the landmark book Continuous Delivery: Reliable Software Releases through Build, Test, and Deployment Automation and are nowadays widely accepted. One of these principles is:

Every executed job should be able to fail the build. If not, developers can miss or ignore the underlying issue, which adds technical debt and might result in problems later.

**Problem**: We analyzed your project and found that the file .gitlab-ci.yml (line 107) violates this principle. Failures of job package:snap (in stage package), cannot fail the build:

package:snap:
...
allow\_failure: true

Suggested Fix: To follow the principle, you should set allow\_failure: false.

**Disclaimer:** This issue has been automatically reported by CD-Linter, a tool developed at the University of Zurich that detects CI/CD violations in the GitLab CI/CD pipeline configuration. We are currently evaluating the effectiveness of our tool and we are monitoring this issue.

Please up/downvote this issue to indicate whether you agree/disagree with the report.

To upload designs, you'll need to enable LFS. More information

#### Problem

#### Fix

https://gitlab.com/bitseater/meteo/-/issues/125



### RQ 1: Reactions to issues









## RQ 1: Reasons for rejecting issues



- Warned jobs are not essential or not fully implemented yet
- The CD smell is contained in a template

C Retry Failure

 Warned jobs are executed on out-of-control machines



#### Manual Execution

- Lack of trust in automated issue reporting
- Warned jobs are not fully integrated yet



• Tools should be automatically updated to the latest version

## RQ 1: Reasons for rejecting issues



- Warned jobs are not essential or not fully implemented yet
- The CD smell is contained in a template

**Retry Failure** 

 Warned jobs are executed on out-of-control machines



#### Manual Execution

- Lack of trust in automated issue reporting
- Warned jobs are not fully integrated yet



 Tools should be automatically updated to the latest version



### Empirical Study





#### **RQ1: Relevance of CD Smells** 0 6-month monitoring of states, comments, and fixes Ð **U 64 Developers** (**Resp. rate: 74%**) 145 (86) Issues **RQ2: Accuracy of CD-Linter 2** validators ("k" agreement: 0.76) 868 Config. files

#### **RQ3: Frequency of CD smells**

### RQ 2: Accuracy of CD-Linter

Precision: 87%

False positives:

- Jobs (with unconventional names) executed in a release stage (Manual Execution)
- Tool dependencies without versions (Fuzzy Version)



Recall: 94%

False negatives:

- Dependencies specified in a .pip file (Fuzzy Version)
- Jobs with release-related names (Manual Execution)





## RQ 3: Frequency of CD smells

• 31% of them are affected by at least one CD smell





**Retry Failure** 

6% of projects

**Fake Success** 





The majority of detected smells (70%) affect projects with long configuration files



**Manual Execution** 





**Fuzzy Version** 



### Implications

## CD-Linter as a *mentor* when configuring CD pipelines

## Linting rules have to be approved by developers

## Long and complex CD configurations are often smelly







#### **Getting Continuous Testing Done Right with CD-Linter**

Carmine Vassallo

#### vassallocarmine@gmail.com



#### CD-Linter: Detecting violations of CD principles









**Fake Success** 

**Retry Failure** 

Manual Execution

**Fuzzy Version** 



