



# Characterizing Architecture Description Languages for Software-Intensive Systems-of-Systems

---

MILENA GUESSI, EVERTON CAVALCANTE, AND  
LUCAS B. R. OLIVEIRA

# Agenda

---

Introduction

Features of ADLs for Describing SoS Software Architectures

ADLs Assessment

Conclusions and Future Research

---

# INTRODUCTION

# SoS Software Architecture

---

SoS are formed by independent, complex software systems, called constituents

- Independent action and decision making

Comprise the structure of constituents, the relationships that exist among them, and the principles and guidelines governing the SoS design and evolution

# Architecture Description

---

Main artifact expressing the software architecture

- Support analysis, construction, and evolution of SoS

Architecture descriptions for SoS:

- Minimize the risk of constituents' stakeholders not being aware of important elements of the SoS
- Support evolution and analysis

# Techniques for Describing Software Architectures

---

## Types:

- Formal languages
  - Based on formal syntax and semantics
- Semi-formal languages
  - Based on defined syntax and lack a complete semantics
- Informal languages

Each type promotes different aspects of architecture descriptions:

- Ease of use, reuse, unambiguous, accuracy, correctness

# Motivation and Objectives

---

There is no consensus about:

- Important characteristics for describing SoS
- Appropriate ADLs for describing SoS

To identify the main features that should be provided by ADLs for SoS

Assess ADLs applied/suggested for describing SoS software architecture

---

# FEATURES OF ADLS FOR DESCRIBING SoS SOFTWARE ARCHITECTURES



# Traditional Features of ADLs

---

## Building Blocks:

- Components
- Connectors
- Configurations

## Features covered:

- Interfaces
- Constraints
- Behavior

Medvidovic, N. and Taylor, R. N. A classification and comparison framework for software architecture description languages. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 70—93, 2000

# Features of ADLs for SoS

---

## Constituents

- Systems or SoS
- Interface (contracts, assumptions)

## Mediators

- Complex entity negotiating the interaction between constituents

## Coalitions

- Arrangement of constituents and mediators

# Features of ADLs for SoS

FEATURES OF ADLs FOR SoS SOFTWARE ARCHITECTURES			
Constituent	Mediator	Coalition	Tool support
Abstract type	Abstract type	Intentional description	Architecture-centric design
Interface	Interface	Constraint	Automated analysis
Semantics	Semantics	Compositionality	Multi-view management
Constraint	Constraint	Evolutionary development	Collaborative environment
Mission	Evolution	Coercion	Knowledge management
Evolution	Non-functional property	Emergent behavior	
Non-functional property		Mission	
		Dynamism	
		Non-functional property	

**Legend**

- Modified (dashed border)
- New (gray background)

---

# ADLs ASSESSMENT

# ADLs Assessment

---

## UML

- Semi-formal
- Most commonly used language for describing SoS

## SysML

- Semi-formal

## SysML + CML

- Semi-formal + formal
- Definition of contracts

## X-UNITY

- Formal
- Definition of interfaces

TABLE I  
DESIGN TIME FEATURES AVAILABLE IN CURRENT ADLS FOR REALIZING SoS ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

Features		ADL			
		<i>UML</i>	<i>SysML</i>	<i>SysML + CML</i>	<i>X-UNITY</i>
Constituent	Abstract type	●	●	●	●
	Interface	●	●	●	○
	Semantics	●	●	●	-
	Constraint	○	●	●	●
	Mission	-	○	-	-
	Evolution	-	-	-	-
	Non-functional property	○	●	●	-
Mediator	Abstract type	○	○	-	-
	Interface	●	●	-	-
	Semantics	●	●	●	-
	Constraint	○	●	●	-
	Evolution	-	-	-	-
	Non-functional property	○	●	●	-
Coalition	Intentional description	○	○	○	●
	Constraint	-	●	●	●
	Compositionality	●	●	●	●
	Evolutionary development	-	-	○	-
	Coercion	-	-	●	○
	Emergent behavior	○	○	●	-
	Mission	-	○	-	-
	Dynamism	-	-	●	-
	Non-functional property	○	●	●	-
Tool support	Architecture-centric design	○	○	○	-
	Automated analysis	-	○	●	-
	Multi-view management	○	○	●	-
	Collaborative environment	-	-	●	-
	Knowledge management	-	-	-	-

● : feature is supported, ○ : feature is partially supported, - : feature is not supported

# ADLs Assessment

---

None of these languages completely support this set of features at runtime<sup>1</sup>

- Lack support for evolution
- SysML + CML seems the most complete approach in terms of covered features

<sup>1</sup> features that can be both designed and enacted at runtime

---

# CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH



# Conclusions

---

Set of features for expressing SoS software Architecture

Desirable features of tools supporting these ADLs

Assessment of current ADLs points out directions for future research

# Future Research

---

## Formal ADLs for SoS

- Ensure correctness and support the evolutionary development
- Requires specialized tools

## Properties of ADLs for SoS

- Contributions for improving understandability, scalability, refinement, traceability, and automation

## Viewpoints for describing SoS

- Most ADLs focus on the structure and behavior of SoS
- Investigate other viewpoints that might be necessary



# Characterizing Architecture Description Languages for Software-Intensive Systems-of-Systems

---

Contact authors: [milena@icmc.usp.br](mailto:milena@icmc.usp.br),  
[evertonrsc@ppgsc.ufrn.br](mailto:evertonrsc@ppgsc.ufrn.br), [buenolro@icmc.usp.br](mailto:buenolro@icmc.usp.br)