



HAL
open science

Dependency Solving Is Still Hard, but We Are Getting Better at It

Pietro Abate, Roberto Di Cosmo, Georgios Gousios, Stefano Zacchiroli

► **To cite this version:**

Pietro Abate, Roberto Di Cosmo, Georgios Gousios, Stefano Zacchiroli. Dependency Solving Is Still Hard, but We Are Getting Better at It. 2020 IEEE 27th International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER), Feb 2020, London, Canada. pp.547-551, 10.1109/SANER48275.2020.9054837 . hal-03005932

HAL Id: hal-03005932

<https://hal.science/hal-03005932>

Submitted on 16 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Dependency Solving Is Still Hard, but We Are Getting Better at It

Pietro Abate

Nomadic Labs

Paris, France

pietro.abate@nomadic-labs.com

Roberto Di Cosmo

Inria and Université de Paris

Paris, France

roberto@dicosmo.org

Georgios Gousios

Delft Univ. of Technology

Delft, The Netherlands

g.gousios@tudelft.nl

Stefano Zacchiroli

Université de Paris and Inria

Paris, France

zack@irif.fr

Abstract—Dependency solving is a hard (NP-complete) problem in all non-trivial component models due to either mutually incompatible versions of the same packages or explicitly declared package conflicts. As such, software upgrade planning needs to rely on highly specialized dependency solvers, lest falling into pitfalls such as incompleteness—a combination of package versions that satisfy dependency constraints does exist, but the package manager is unable to find it.

In this paper we look back at proposals from dependency solving research dating back a few years. Specifically, we review the idea of treating dependency solving as a separate concern in package manager implementations, relying on generic dependency solvers based on tried and tested techniques such as SAT solving, PBO, MILP, etc.

By conducting a census of dependency solving capabilities in state-of-the-art package managers we conclude that some proposals are starting to take off (e.g., SAT-based dependency solving) while—with few exceptions—others have not (e.g., outsourcing dependency solving to reusable components). We reflect on why that has been the case and look at novel challenges for dependency solving that have emerged since.

Index Terms—software components, dependency solving, SAT solving, package manager, separation of concerns

I. INTRODUCTION

Initially introduced in the early 90s, package managers have been used to support the life-cycle of software components—listing available packages, installing, removing, and/or upgrading them—for several decades now. Initially prevalent in UNIX-like software distributions, they have reached peak popularity during the past decade expanding first to development stacks for library management—at the time of writing `libraries.io` [13] lists more than 30 package managers, most of which are programming language-specific—and then to final users in various “app stores” forms.

One of the key responsibilities of package managers [7] is *dependency solving*. In a nutshell, a dependency solver takes as input: (1) the current *status* of packages installed on a given system, (2) a *universe* of all available packages, (3) a *user request* (e.g., “install the `aiohhttp` library”), and (4) explicit or implicit *user preferences* (e.g., “only install strictly required packages” v. “install all recommended packages too”). As its output, a dependency solver produces an *upgrade plan*, which is a partially ordered list of low-level actions that should be executed to reach a *new* status that satisfies the user request; example of such actions are “download version 18.2.0 of the

`attr` library”, “uninstall version 3.5.4 of `aiohhttp`”, and “install version 3.6.2 of `aiohhttp` from downloaded zip file”.

Dependency solving is a hard problem in all non-trivial component models. It has first been shown to be NP-complete in 2006 for expressive dependencies such as Debian’s [16]—which allows version predicates (e.g., `python3-aiohhttp >= 3.0.1`), AND/OR logical connectors, virtual packages, and explicit inter-package conflicts. Intuitively, the difficulty of dependency solving comes from the fact that it is not enough to explore the dependency tree of the package you want to install, because you might need arbitrarily deep backtracking to check *if* a valid solution to the user request does exist. In formal terms, (Debian’s) dependency solving can be encoded as a SAT solving problem and vice-versa [11], [14], [16].

More recently [2] it has been shown that even much simpler component models induce NP-completeness, it is enough for a package manager to support multiple package versions and to forbid co-installation of different versions of the same package (which is almost invariably the case).

The complexity of dependency solving is further increased by the fact that users generally do not want *a* solution; but rather an *optimal* one w.r.t. some criteria, even when they are not stated explicitly. For instance, when requesting to install `wesnoth` users generally expect to install the *minimum amount of additional packages* that allow them to play that game (also known as the “minimum install problem” [23]). This translate to an optimization problem, which poses additional challenges on dependency solving implementation.

During the 2005–2015 decade it had been observed how most state-of-the-art package managers were incomplete (i.e., incapable of proposing a valid upgrade plan when one existed) and not expressive enough (i.e., not allowing users to express user preferences to drive the optimization part of dependency solving). A substantial body of research has been devoted to study dependency solving to improve the capabilities of package managers, in particular in the framework of the Mancoosi European research project [17].

In this paper we look back at one particular proposal [2] from back then, that of *treating dependency solving as a separate concern in package manager* design and implementation, delegating it to a specialized, highly-capable dependency solver based on state-of-the-art constraint solving and optimization techniques.




Fig. 1. CUDF: a common language to encode dependency solving scenarios (figure from [2])

Paper structure: We review the “separate concern” proposal in Section II; we conduct a census of dependency solving capabilities for state-of-the-art package managers (Section III); based on census results we reflect on what has actually come true of that proposal (Section IV); we conclude considering novel challenges for dependency solving (Section V).

II. DEPENDENCY SOLVING AS A SEPARATE CONCERN

We can breakdown the research proposal [2] we are reviewing into two main claims. The first was that dependency solving should be expressive. *Expressive* in the sense that dependency expressions should be powerful (package name and version predicates, conflicts, boolean connectors, etc.) and that users should have the possibility of expressing their own optimization criteria to complement built-in ones. To reap the benefits of such expressivity dependency solvers should be *complete*. And to that end dependency solver implementations should not be improvised using ad-hoc heuristics, but rather delegated to specialized solvers based on tried and tested techniques in constraint solving and optimization.

The second claim was that there is no need to reinvent the dependency solving wheels over and over again, once for each package manager. We can instead build capable dependency solvers once (multiple times only if justified by the use of different techniques or to innovate in neighbor areas), and plug them into package managers as needed.

To support these claims a formal representation language called CUDF (for Common Upgradeability Description Format [20]) was designed, with the idea of using it as a *lingua franca* between package managers and solvers, as depicted in Fig. 1. According to this view a package manager facing a dependency solving user request will first translate it to an *upgrade problem* expressed in CUDF, then invoke a CUDF-enabled dependency solver on it, which will return a CUDF-encoded solution to the original package manager. As shown in the *modular package manager* architecture of Fig. 2, only the back and forth CUDF translations are platform-specific; dependency solvers themselves are package manager agnostic and hence reusable.

As practical evidence of the feasibility of that approach an international dependency solving competition, called MISC [2], has been run for 3 yearly editions from 2010 to

TABLE I
GENERAL PURPOSE, CUDF-ENABLE DEPENDENCY SOLVERS (MISC 2010–2011 SAMPLE PARTICIPANTS).

CUDF solver	technique / solver
<i>apt-pbo</i> [22]	Pseudo Boolean Optimization
<i>aspcud</i> [12]	Answer Set Programming
<i>inesc</i> [4]	Max-SAT
<i>p2cudf</i> [4]	Pseudo Boolean Optimization / Sat4j [15]
<i>ucl</i>	Graph constraints
<i>unsa</i> [18]	Mixed Integer Linear Programming / CPLEX [6]

2012, using CUDF as the input/output format for participating solvers. The competition has been run on real dependency solving problems gathered by package manager users (via a submission system) as well as on randomly generated ones, starting from real-world package repositories. All data used as input for the competition has been made publicly available [19]. As a byproduct of MISC, several CUDF-speaking general purpose dependency solvers have been released; some examples are shown in Table I.

III. A DEPENDENCY SOLVING CENSUS

Almost a decade later, has this view of expressive, complete, and mutualized dependency solving become true?

To verify that we have conducted a census of the dependency solving capabilities of current package managers. We have included in the census major language-specific package managers from libraries.io [13] as well as package managers from notable Free/Open Source Software (FOSS) distributions and platforms, such as Debian, RedHat and Eclipse.

Census results are summarized in Table II. For each package manager we considered the following dimensions:

Versioning scheme: How does the package manager specify versions for the artifacts it manages? Common versioning schemes include semantic versioning (*semver*) and its derivatives, where a version is identified by a quadruplet `major.minor.patch.qualifier`, where each qualifier specifies an order. Other schemes include Debian’s version spec (*debian*) and using free form strings with no ordering semantics (*git tags, strings*).

Distribution: How are packages distributed? Most package managers use centralized *archives*, whereas a new trend




Fig. 2. A modular package manager architecture (figure from [3])

is to use `github` as a distribution platform in addition to collaboration.

Granularity: What is the minimal unit that can be versioned? Most dependency managers version artifacts at the package level, but some, notably those that support package distribution over `github` also allow versioning of repository branches.

Version Locking: Does the package manager support locking the results of a package resolution? Most package managers enable this option, to help developers maintain reproducible builds.

Qualifiers: Does the package manager support selecting specific dependencies based on external build configurations? One such typical example is the inclusion of test runner dependencies only when running tests. Many package managers enable this feature to minimize the set of dependencies in specific environments.

Dependency range operators: What levels of expressivity does the package manager range specification language enable? Package managers that use semantic versioning (or other types of hierarchical versioning) enable users to specify ranges of dependency versions a package depends upon. For example, a package might depend on all patch versions of an artifact version 4.3; this can be expressed as a range: `>= 4.3.*`. To express more complex scenarios, many package managers allow boolean operators on ranges.

Range modifiers: Even more complex scenarios might arise with dependency ranges: what if a developer wants to express a constraint such as “update to all new minor versions, but not to the next major one”. Range modifiers enable developers to anticipate new patch (`flex patch`) or new minor (`flex minor`) versions without having to explicitly modify their project’s manifest files.

Resolution process: We consider the following facets of package managers approaches to dependency solving:

- *Correctness:* Will the package manager always propose solutions that respect dependency constraints?
- *Completeness:* Will the package manager always find a solution if one exists?
- *User preferences:* Can the user provide custom optimization criteria to discriminate among valid solutions? For example, in order to minimize/maximize the number of

packages matching stated characteristic [21] or to veto certain packages.

Approximate solutions: When a solution cannot be found, some package manager may try to proceed anyway by relaxing some constraints.

- *Missing dependencies:* When a dependency version constraint cannot be satisfied, most package managers will report an error, while some (e.g., `Cargo` and `Maven`) will ignore the error and install the latest available version.
- *Conflicts:* When the transitive closure of a dependency resolution includes more than one version of the same artifact, most package managers will bail out with an error, as no valid solution exists. Some package managers on the other hand will force the installation to complete nonetheless: `Cargo` rewrites the conflicting symbol names to enable multiple versions of libraries to co-exist; others select the version that is closer to the root of the dependency tree of the package whose dependencies are being resolved.

Among the various features listed above, user defined preferences for driving dependency resolution appear to be the least known, hence we provide here a few examples to illustrate what they look like and how they are used.

The `opam` package manager for the OCaml programming language offers the user a rich set of preferences,¹ here is an example:

```
opam install merlin --criteria="-changed,-removed"
```

which requests to install `merlin`. Since this is a development tool, the user does not want its installation to impact other libraries installed in the system that might be also used as build dependencies of the project. To this end, the `-changed, -removed` preferences indicate that, among all possible solutions, we prefer the one that minimizes changes to the system, and minimizes removal of other packages.

IV. DISCUSSION

The first observation about census findings (Table II) is that, almost 15 years after the seminal work dependency solving NP-completeness, a significant set of package managers rely on robust, specialized solvers, able to support correct and

¹See https://opam.ocaml.org/doc/External_solvers.html for full details.

TABLE II
DEPENDENCY SOLVING FEATURE MATRIX FOR STATE-OF-THE-ART PACKAGE MANAGERS.

Package manager	Version scheme	Solver	Distribution granularity		Version locking	Qualif.	Dependency operators				Range modifiers		Resolution process			Approximate solutions	
							gt/lt	and	or	not	flex patch	flex minor	correctness	complete-ness	user prefs	missing deps	conflict
Go (dep)	git tags	ad hoc	github	branch	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	error	error
npm	semver	ad hoc	archive	package	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	?	?	no	error	keep both
Packagist	git tags	ad hoc	github	branch	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	?	?	?	error
opam	debian	CUDF (any)	git	package	work-around	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	error	error
PyPI / pip	pep-440	ad hoc	archive	package	yes	conda	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	error	error
Nuget	semver	ad hoc	archive	package	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	error	nearest wins
Paket	semver	ad hoc	archive, github	package, branch	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	error	error
Maven	semver	ad hoc	archive	package	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	with plug-ins	latest	nearest wins
RubyGems	semver	ad hoc	archive	package	yes	bundler	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	?	?	?	error	error
Cargo	semver	ad hoc	archive, git	package, branch	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	latest	name mangling
CPAN	strings	ad hoc	archive	package	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	error	error
Bower	semver	ad hoc	git	package	?	?	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	error	use resolutions
Clojars	semver	ad hoc	archive	package	?	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	error	error	error
CRAN	debian	ad hoc	archive, git	package	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	error	error
Hackage / cabal	semver	?	archive	package	?	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	?	no	no	error	error
Debian (apt)	debian	CUDF (any)	package	package	pinning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	error	error
RedHat (dnf)	dnf	libzypp	archive	package	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	?	error	error
Eclipse P2	semver	sat4j	archive	package	?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	error	error

complete dependency solving—e.g., Eclipse uses P2, built on top Sat4J [15], SUSE and RedHat use `libsolv` (itself based on the `libzypp`² SAT solver), while Debian and Opam can use any external CUDF solver. This is good news: the importance of using complete dependency solvers seems now well acknowledged and it seems to be common knowledge that this entails leveraging solver technologies like SAT, MaxSAT, PBO, ASP or MILP, instead of ad-hoc dependency graph traversals. We consider that a significant part of the first claim of [2] actually made it through.

On the other side, it seems that only Opam has embraced [1] the “separation of concern” approach advocated in [2], with `apt-get` somewhat halfway through, as it offers access to external solvers only as an option. There are several factors that may explain this limited success: some are technical, others are of social nature.

From the technical point of view, we notice two issues. First, the CUDF format has some shortcomings. While it is very

well adapted for package managers that use versioning and dependency schemes similar to the Debian ones, it does not support natively dependency constraints involving qualifiers (used by Eclipse P2) or non overlapping version intervals (npm)—they *can* be supported, but at the cost of additional complexity in the CUDF adapter. Second, while relying on one or more external solvers may be a smart choice in the long run,³ it introduces an external dependency in a key component, the package manager, that needs to be properly catered for. These two aspects have likely reduced the buy-in on relying on third party CUDF solvers.

As for the social aspects, a broad adoption of the “separation of concern” approach would mean convincing *not one community, but many*, to adapt the architecture of one of their key tools and accept to rely a *common standard* on which they would have individually little leverage. This is a significant social challenge, and it is understandable that many preferred

³This is shown by the recent switch made in Opam from the `aspcud` solver to `mccs`, triggered by performance issues that only showed up with the growing number of existing packages.

²https://en.opensuse.org/openSUSE:Libzypp_satsolver

to retain full control on their package manager, and just hard-wire in it a specific solver, especially when one written in the same programming language was available.

Hence we believe that it is already a significant success to see the proposed approach embraced in full by the Opam package manager, which is also the only one offering full support for flexible user preferences. The direct implication in the Opam/OCaml community of some of the proponents of [2] has surely been an important adoption factor too. “If you build it, they will come” is not always enough; broad adoption also needs to actually go out of your way (and role) to *make* the needed adaptations and provide concrete evidence of the conveyed advantages.

V. OUTLOOK

“Dependency hell” is a colloquial term denoting the frustration resulting from the inability to install software due to complicated dependencies. From the review we conducted one cannot conclude that the problem is solved. However, the situation significantly improved w.r.t. less than a decade ago. Several package managers are both correct and complete—the two properties that contribute the most to addressing the dependency hell—and the reinvention of dependency solving wheels has been avoided in at least a few notable cases. All in all, it seems that good dependency solving practices are spreading, which makes us hopeful for a better future.

Novel dependency management approaches have emerged since the proposals reviewed in this paper. On the one hand, containerization and virtual environments have gained significant traction; functional package managers [5], [8] have become more popular, due to analogies with container technology and a surge in the interest for scientific and build reproducibility. These approaches share the ability to create separate package namespaces on-the-fly, allowing to deploy side-by-side packages that would be incompatible in a shared namespace. This has alleviated the need for correct and complete dependency solving, but we speculate it will not for long—the recent announcement⁴ that PyPI/pip, a software ecosystem in which virtual environments are really popular, is finally going to implement proper dependency solving seems to be a step in the right direction.

Novel challenges are emerging on the front of dependency *auditing*. For example, there is no way for developers to know whether a security issue affecting a dependency is also affecting their programs. Licensing incompatibilities cannot be easily detected either, even though most packages come with accompanying license metadata. The root cause behind those issues is that the finest granularity in package management is still the package, whereas software reuse happens at finer levels (e.g., modules, functions, etc.) [10]. This discrepancy leads to lost opportunities. The construction of inter-package call graphs, as envisaged by the FASTEN [9] project, may unlock several new package manager features, such as precise tracking of security and licensing incompatibility issues, data-driven API evolution, and several others.

⁴<https://github.com/python/request-for/blob/master/2020-pip/RFP.md>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been partially funded by the FASTEN project, part of the European Commission H2020 program (contract: 825328).

REFERENCES

- [1] Pietro Abate, Roberto Di Cosmo, Louis Gesbert, Fabrice Le Fessant, and Stefano Zacchiroli. Using preferences to tame your package manager. In *OCaml 2014: The OCaml Users and Developers Workshop*, 2014.
- [2] Pietro Abate, Roberto Di Cosmo, Ralf Treinen, and Stefano Zacchiroli. Dependency solving: a separate concern in component evolution management. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 85(10):2228–2240, 2012.
- [3] Pietro Abate, Roberto Di Cosmo, Ralf Treinen, and Stefano Zacchiroli. A modular package manager architecture. *Information and Software Technology*, 55(2):459–474, February 2013.
- [4] Josep Argelich, Daniel Le Berre, Inês Lynce, Joao Marques-Silva, and Pascal Rapicault. Solving Linux upgradeability problems using boolean optimization. In *LoCoCo: Logics for Component Configuration*, volume 29 of *EPTCS*, pages 11–22, 2010.
- [5] Ludovic Courtès. Functional package management with guix. In *ELS 2013: 6th European Lisp Symposium*, pages 4–14, 2013.
- [6] IBM ILOG CPLEX. V12. 1: User’s manual for cplex. *International Business Machines Corporation*, 46(53):157, 2009.
- [7] Roberto Di Cosmo, Paulo Trezentos, and Stefano Zacchiroli. Package upgrades in FOSS distributions: Details and challenges. In *HotSWUp’08: Hot Topics in Software Upgrades*. ACM, 2008.
- [8] Eelco Dolstra, Andres LÖh, and Nicolas Pierron. Nixos: A purely functional linux distribution. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 20(5-6):577–615, 2010.
- [9] Fine-grained analysis of software ecosystems as networks FASTEN, 2019. Homepage: <https://www.fasten-project.eu/>.
- [10] Mark Florisson and Alan Mycroft. Towards a theory of packages, 2017. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/560e/2dc1c37cd5c21a9ac935584d137c6fdd3ac0.pdf>.
- [11] Michael R Garey and David S Johnson. *Computers and intractability*, volume 29. wh freeman New York, 2002.
- [12] Martin Gebser, Roland Kaminski, and Torsten Schaub. aspcud: A linux package configuration tool based on answer set programming. In *LoCoCo 2011: Logics for Component Configuration*, volume 65 of *EPTCS*, pages 12–25, 2011.
- [13] Jeremy Katz. Libraries.io open source repository and dependency metadata, December 2018.
- [14] Daniel Le Berre and Anne Parrain. On SAT technologies for dependency management and beyond. In *SPLC (2)*, pages 197–200. Lero Int. Science Centre, University of Limerick, Ireland, 2008.
- [15] Daniel Le Berre and Anne Parrain. The sat4j library, release 2.2, system description. *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation*, 7:59–64, 2010.
- [16] Fabio Mancinelli, Jaap Boender, Roberto Di Cosmo, Jerome Vouillon, Berke Durak, Xavier Leroy, and Ralf Treinen. Managing the complexity of large free and open source package-based software distributions. In *ASE 2006: 21st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 199–208, 2006.
- [17] Managing the complexity of the open source infrastructure (Mancoosi), 2008. Factsheet: <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/86231/factsheet>.
- [18] Claude Michel and Michel Rueher. Handling software upgradeability problems with MILP solvers. In *LoCoCo 2010: Logics for Component Configuration*, volume 29 of *EPTCS*, pages 1–10, 2010.
- [19] Mancoosi project. Data from the Mancoosi solver competition and articles, November 2019. doi:10.5281/zenodo.3556644.
- [20] Ralf Treinen and Stefano Zacchiroli. Common upgradeability description format (cudf) 2.0. Technical report, Mancoosi project, 2009.
- [21] Ralf Treinen and Stefano Zacchiroli. Expressing advanced user preferences in component installation. In *IWOCE 2009: International Workshop on Open Component Ecosystem*, pages 31–40. ACM, 2009.
- [22] Paulo Trezentos, Inês Lynce, and Arlindo Oliveira. Apt-pbo: Solving the software dependency problem using pseudo-boolean optimization. In *ASE’10: Automated Software Engineering*, pages 427–436. ACM, 2010.
- [23] Chris Tucker, David Shuffelton, Ranjit Jhala, and Sorin Lerner. Opium: Optimal package install/uninstall manager. In *29th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE’07)*, pages 178–188. IEEE, 2007.