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Getting (Re)acquainted

Transition

Current Work and Challenges
Product Line Systems Program

Our Mission:
To effect widespread product line practice, architecture-centric development and evolution, and predictable software construction throughout the global software community.

Product Line System initiatives:
- *Software Architecture Technology (SAT) Initiative*
- Product Line Practice Initiative
- Predictable Assembly from Certifiable Components Initiative
Focus: Software Architecture

The quality and longevity of a software system is largely determined by its architecture.

Too many experiences point to inadequate software architecture education and practices and the lack of any real software architecture evaluation early in the life cycle.

Without an explicit course of action focused on software architecture, these experiences are being and will be repeated.

The cost of inaction is too great.
What Is a Software Architecture?

“The software architecture of a program or computing system is the structure or structures of the system, which comprise the software elements, the externally visible properties of those elements, and the relationships among them.”

Why Is Software Architecture Important?

The right architecture paves the way for system success.
The wrong architecture usually spells some form of disaster.

Represents *earliest* design decisions
- hardest to change
- most critical to get right
- communication vehicle among stakeholders

*First* design artifact addressing
- performance
- modifiability
- reliability
- security

Key to systematic *reuse*
- transferable, reusable abstraction
SEI Software Architecture Technology (SAT) Initiative’s Focus

Ensure that business and mission goals are predictably achieved by using effective software architecture practices throughout the development lifecycle.

“Axioms” Guiding Our Work

- Software architecture is the bridge between business and mission goals and a software-intensive system.
- Quality attribute requirements drive software architecture design.
- Software architecture drives software development throughout the life cycle.

Earliest work focused on the second axiom leading to the Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Method® (ATAM®)
SEI’s Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Method® (ATAM®)

The ATAM is an architecture evaluation method that focuses on multiple quality attributes

- illuminates points in the architecture where quality attribute tradeoffs occur
- generates a context for ongoing quantitative analysis
- utilizes an architecture’s vested stakeholders as authorities on the quality attribute goals
Conceptual Flow of the ATAM®

Business Drivers ➔ Quality Attributes ➔ Scenarios ➔ Analysis
Software Architecture ➔ Architectural Approaches ➔ Architectural Decisions

Impacts ➔ Risk Themes ➔ distilled into Tradeoffs, Sensitivity Points, Non-Risks, Risks
Architecture-Centric Development Activities

Architecture-centric activities include the following:

- creating the business case for the system
- understanding the requirements
- creating and/or selecting the architecture
- documenting and communicating the architecture
- analyzing or evaluating the architecture
- implementing the system based on the architecture
- ensuring that the implementation conforms to the architecture
ATAM® Led to the Development of Other Methods and Techniques

- What if the quality requirements are not well-understood?
  - Quality Attribute Workshop (QAW)

- What if there’s no architecture?
  - Attribute Driven Design (ADD)

- What if I don’t know my system’s architecture?
  - Architecture Reconstruction using ARMIN

- Our scenarios tend to be incomplete or ambiguous.

- What are some of the most important questions to ask?
  - Quality Attribute Tactics

- Which risks should I work on first?
  - Cost Benefit Analysis Method (CBAM)

- What information should be included in my architecture documentation?
  - Views and Beyond Approach (VaB)
Characteristics of SEI Methods

- are explicitly focused on quality attributes
- directly link to business and mission goals
- explicitly involve system stakeholders
- are grounded in state-of-the-art quality attribute models and reasoning frameworks
- are documented for practitioner consumption
- are applicable to DoD challenges and DoD systems

QAW
ADD
Views and Beyond
ATAM
CBAM
ARMIN
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SAT: Transition

KEY:
- Ongoing
- In Sustainment
- Just Begun
## Certificate Program Course Matrix

### Three Certificate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Software Architecture Professional</th>
<th>ATAM® Evaluator</th>
<th>ATAM® Lead Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software Architecture: Principles and Practice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting Software Architectures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Architecture Design and Analysis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Product Lines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM® Evaluator Training</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM® Leader Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAM® Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Method ® (ATAM ®)*
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ATAM® Led to the Development of Other Methods and Techniques

What if the quality requirements are not well-understood?

What if there’s no architecture?

What if I don’t know my system’s architecture?

Our scenarios tend to be incomplete or ambiguous.

What are some of the most important questions to ask?

Which risks should I work on first?

What information should be included in my architecture documentation?

Views and Beyond Approach (VaB)

Attribute Driven Design (ADD)

Organization Context

Quality Attribute General Scenarios

Non-Risks

Cost Benefit Analysis Method (CBAM)

System Context

Attribute Analysis

Tradeoffs

Sensitivity Points

Risks

Our scenarios tend to be incomplete or ambiguous.

Attribute Driven Design (ADD)

Quality Attribute General Scenarios

Cost Benefit Analysis Method (CBAM)

Our scenarios tend to be incomplete or ambiguous.
Problem

- The architecture of a software intensive system must continually evolve to ensure consistency between the system and its **mission and business goals**
  - “Tactical evolution” focuses on change over a short time horizon to ensure system consistency with current business and mission goals.
  - “Strategic evolution” focuses on change over a long time horizon with an emphasis on handling uncertainty in future business and mission goals.
Architecture Evolution - 2

Approach

- Leverage generality and composability of SEI architecture-centric practices to create need-specific methods to support evolution
  - architecture fact finding
  - architecture improvement
  - comparing architectures
  - enhanced cost-benefit analysis
- Link quality attribute tactics with patterns
- Use economic models, such as real options, in tandem with quality attribute models
Architecture Competence

Problem

• To date, we have focused on the “technical aspects” of software architecture, not the people and organizational aspects.
• To facilitate organizational adoption and improvement of architecture-centric software engineering practices organizations need help in measuring and improving the architecture of their individuals and teams

Approach

• Exploit relevant models
  – Organizational coordination mechanisms
  – Human performance model
  – Organization learning
• The work also involves
  – Exploring the relationship between business goals and quality attributes
  – Surveying community about best practices for architects and organizations
  – Crafting pilot assessment instruments
  – Pursuing case studies in competence improvement
System ATAM and SoS Architecture Evaluation

Problem

- Severe integration and runtime problems arise due to inconsistencies in how quality attributes are addressed in system and software architectures.
- This is further exacerbated in a System of Systems (SoS) context where major system and software elements are developed concurrently.

Approach

- Make minor enhancements to the ATAM for use on system architectures.
- Develop a method to perform a "first pass" identification of inconsistencies between constituent systems of SoSs by using mission threads augmented with quality attribute concerns.
A Sampling of New Challenges

Providing automated support for architecture design and evolution while accounting for trade-offs.

- **Our Research:** Developing an architecture design assistant, which provides quality attribute, architecture design and trade-off assistance.

Managing uncertainty in future business and mission goals

- **Our Research:** Using real options to determine the value of flexibility.

Ensuring that our architecture models and methods apply to emerging technologies and contexts such as service-oriented architectures, system of systems, and ultra-large scale systems

- **Our Research:** Applying our methods to service-oriented architectures and determining architecture concepts and approaches relevant to system of systems and ultra-large-scale systems.
Problem: guide an architect in producing a design satisfying multiple (possibly conflicting) quality attribute requirements.

ArchE can:
- Indicate unsatisfied quality attribute requirements
- Offer tactics for improving the design
- Explore a rich design space

Software Architecture Technology Initiative
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Application of Real Options to Architecture

An option is the right, but not the obligation to take an action in the future when there is uncertainty

Architecture evolution involves uncertainty

- managing uncertainty requires flexibility in making design decisions
- real options provide a tool to guide evolution
- flexibility is valuable; how much is it worth?

Sources of uncertainty that have implications for software architecture

- business goals (e.g. time to market, interoperability)
- resources (e.g. access to information for the decision and developer time)
- key quality attributes (e.g. search latency should be less than 1 second and system should by 99.99999% available)
Mechanism Design

**Problem**: What if there is not central locus of control to manage and coordinate system design and evolution?

**We are investigating**: Mechanism design uses economics and game theory to obtain desired global solutions for systems that have many self-interested participants.
We want your input!

Our ongoing goals are to

- Respond to the needs of the world
- Increase our level of impact
- Base techniques and methods on theoretically sound foundations

*We are very much looking forward to getting your thoughts!*