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Abstract. Quality attributes (QAs) and constraints are among the principal drivers of architectural decision-making. QAs are improved or damaged by architectural decisions (ADs), while constraints directly include or exclude parts of the architecture (e.g., logical components or technologies). We may determine the impact of an AD, or which parts of the architecture are affected by a constraint, but at the end it is hard to know if we are respecting the quality requirements (requirements over the QAs) and the imposed constraints with all the ADs made. In the usual approach, architects use their own experience to produce software architectures that comply with the expected quality requirements and imposed constraints, but at the end, especially for crucial decisions, the architect has to deal with complex trade-offs between QAs and juggle with possible incompatibilities raised by the imposed constraints. In this paper we present Quark, a method to assist software architects in architectural decision-making, and the conceptualization of the relationship between QRs and ADs defined in Arteon, an ontology to represent and manage architectural knowledge. Finally, we also give an insight into the Quark and Arteon implementation, the ArchiTech tool.
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1 Introduction

In the last decade, software architecture has become one of the most active research areas in software engineering. As a significant trend in this community, many researchers have stated that architectural decisions (ADs) are the core of software architecture [1]. Under this view, software architecture has evolved from a structural representation to a decision-centered viewpoint [2].

In this paper, we present Quark (Quality in Architectural Knowledge), a method to assist software architects in architectural decision-making. Quark builds upon Architectural Knowledge (AK) [3] using an ontology (Arteon [4]) to manage and reuse knowledge about ADs, their rationale and their link to quality attributes (QAs) and constraints. We also present in this paper the part of Arteon related to ADs (this part was not presented in [4]). The concepts defined
in Arteon are tightly related to the Quark method, in particular the conceptualization of the relationship between QRs and ADs. Finally, we give an insight into the Quark and Arteon implementation, the ArchiTech tool. ArchiTech was already presented in [29], we only include a short description for completeness.

The highlights of Quark, Arteon, and ArchiTech are: first, they have been designed using empirical basis, we asked to architects what they want and need from an architectural design method; second, they use a decision-centered perspective, which is aligned with the trend in architectural research; and third, they use quality requirements (QRs) to drive the decision-making.

The rest of this paper is divided in: related work in Section 2. The Quark method in Section 3. The representation of ADs in Arteon in Section 4. An example of use of Quark and Arteon in Section 5. An analysis of the presented work in Section 6. The ArchiTech tool in Section 7. And conclusions, limitations, and future work in Section 8.

2 Related Work

Several methods for software architecture design and analysis have been proposed. In general all these methods offer a gain in the reliability of the architecture design process, and all the methods have identified quality as the main driver for the architectural design process.

SEI methods [5], namely ADD for design and ATAM for analysis, are heavyweight methods that require large-scale projects to achieve a balance between what the method offers and the effort that supposes for the architects to use it. This balance is hard to achieve when projects are low- or medium-scale. In our case, we based our method in suggestions from architects working in low- or medium-scale projects (see Section 3), therefore we believe that the method can be successfully applied to this kind of projects.

Tang et al. proposed the AREL method [6] to improve the traceability of ADs by linking them to the design rationale. They also propose a conceptual model to manage this rationale, but they focus on the concerns and outcomes, while in our case we focus on the relationship among quality and ADs.

J. Bosch [7] presented the QASAR method, this method consists of three steps: first, the functional requirements are implemented in components, then the architecture is analyzed to decide whether the QRs are fulfilled or not, and in the third step the architecture is adapted to be in conformance with the QRs. As Quark, QASAR relies in QRs, but in QASAR first there is a design based only in functional requirements, and then it is refined using the QRs. Instead, Quark uses QRs from the very beginning as the main driver of the decision-making.

M. Matinlassi et al. [8] propose QADA, a set of methods: one method for selecting an appropriate architecture approach, one method for quality-driven architecture design, one method for evaluating the maturity and quality of architecture, and one technique for representing variation points in the family architecture. As Quark, it is quality-driven and it is built upon a knowledge base, but it is not centered in ADs.
H. Choi et al. [9] propose AQUA, a method that provides software architects means for achieving QAs at the architectural level. AQUA involves two kinds of activities, which are architectural evaluation and transformation. AQUA uses a decision-centered approach as we do in Quark, but it does not have an ontological foundation and their method is not based on empirical studies.

3 The Quark Method

QRs express desired qualities of the system to be developed such as system performance, availability, dependability, maintainability and portability. Over the years, a common claim made by software engineers is that it is not feasible to produce a software system that meets stakeholders needs without taking QRs into account. QRs affect different activities and roles related to the software development process. One of the strongest links is with software architecture, especially architectural decision-making [10]. This observation is the main driver of Quark: facilitate and making more reliable architects’ decisions with regard to the desired qualities. The design of Quark has been also driven from some observations gathered from empirical studies [11] [12]:

(a) Software architects are the main source of QRs. This is why the method is centered in the architect role.
(b) Software architects may be receptive to new design methods as far as they still keep the control on the final ADs. The method should suggest alternatives instead of making final ADs.
(c) The amount of information provided by the architects should pay itself. Software architects are pragmatic, a balance between effort and benefit must be reached in order to make the method suitable for them.
(d) The produced ADs should be justified, because architects also have to justify them to other stakeholders.

In Quark, the software architect plays the central role. Architects specify the QRs and constraints (a). Architects select among the inferred ADs, and decide when the process has to end (b). In the same direction, Quark is not intrusive. It notifies about possible incompatibilities and possible actions to solve them, but the method does not require resolving any incompatibility to continue with the design, it is up to the architect (b). Using the Arteon ontology helps to reuse ADs (c) and also allows to produce detailed information on how an AD was reached, and why it was motivated (d).

The Quark method delivers an iterative process divided in four activities (see Figure 1): first, specification of the QRs and the imposed constraints; second, inference of ADs; third, decision-making; and fourth, architectural refinement (when necessary). Whenever the solution is refined, activities 1-3 are repeated. In the following subsections we give details on each activity.

3.1 Architectural Specification

In the first activity, the architect specifies the QRs and constraints that are relevant for the architecture design. For example, a QR could be “performance
should be high” (in other words, more a goal than a requirement) or something more concrete as “loan processing response time should not be higher than two seconds 95% of the times”. Constraints are typically referring to technologies, e.g., “the database management system (DBMS) must be MySQL 5”, but may also refer to architectural principles, patterns or styles, as in “the architectural style must be Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA)”. These requirements and constraints may come from the project documentation or from the architect’s experience (as we found out in our empirical studies [11] [12]).

Due to Quark’s iterative nature, aligning with to the conclusions we obtained in our empirical studies (the architect wants to have full control of the process), the specification of these QRs and constraints does not need to be complete. The architect has freedom to decide if s/he wants to start from a very short specification and then make the architecture grow in each refinement or if s/he wants to provide a more complete specification and see if the expected quality calculated by the method matches the expected QRs, and then refine till the architecture complies with the requirements.

3.2 Decision Inference

In the second activity, the Quark method uses the AK available in the Arteon ontology to generate a list of ADs. Since the expected amount of ADs in a real case is large, they should be prioritized using some criteria (e.g., the ADs that satisfy more constraints and better comply with the stated QRs are top priority).

ADs need to be informative. This means that, beyond their name, ADs must include information about: why the AD was offered?, what is the impact in the
overall architecture quality?, and what other implications involve making the AD? (a more complete description could be, e.g., the template proposed in [1]).

For example, for the AD of using “data replication” we could answer the above questions as follows: “the AD of having data replication is offered because there is a QR about having high performance”, “by making this AD, the overall performance will increase but will affect negatively to the maintenance, and can damage the accuracy”, “also, by selecting this AD, the used DBMS is required to be able to operate with data replication.”

3.3 Decision-Making

In the third activity, the architect decides which ADs wants to apply from the ones obtained in the previous activity. When the architect makes an AD, two things may happen. First, there could be incompatibilities with previous ADs (e.g., the architect decides to use “data replication”, but s/he already selected a DBMS that does not support data replication), and second, there could be one or more QRs that are not supported by the ADs made (e.g., the ADs made indicate that maintainability will be damaged while there is a QR that says that maintainability is very important for this project).

In both cases, the architect will be informed about which ADs are conflicting, but at the end s/he will decide if the set of ADs is satisfactory or not. In some cases there may be external reasons, beyond QRs and constraints, that have higher priority (e.g., the method recommends to use PostgreSQL but the development team is more experienced with MySQL, and there is not a big loss in the overall quality between both DBMS).

After the decision-making, the architect has the opportunity to conclude the process by accepting the current set of ADs and their impact in the QAs. As mentioned in [1], we understand the software architecture as a set of ADs. Alternatively, the architect may choose to start a new iteration of the full cycle.

3.4 Architectural Refinement

The Refinement activity is for detecting issues that may be resolved in the next iteration. We identified three possible issues: incompatibilities, dependencies, and suggestions for QRs. Incompatibilities (mentioned in 3.3) are converted into new conditions over the attributes of the architectural elements (see Section 4.4). E.g., the AD to use “data replication” sets a condition over an attribute "supports replication" over the DBMS architectural element. Dependencies occur when some AD requires other parts in the architecture. E.g., when the architect decides to use SOA, several related ADs are needed: service implementation (SOAP, REST, ...), service granularity (service composition, single service, ...), etc. And last, we may infer that some QA is of special relevance due to the selected ADs. E.g., if many ADs have positive impact on security, Quark will suggest to the architect to include a QR about security (this also helps making QRs explicit).

The incompatibilities and dependencies are translated into constraints, while the suggestions imply new QRs. In the Specification activity the architect decides
which constraints and QRs will be included in the next iteration. At this point, the architect can also modify the constraints and QRs, e.g., the architect may have noticed that one QR is limiting the alternatives and decide to soften it.

4 Managing and Reusing Architectural Knowledge

Central to Quark is the management and reuse of the AK that supports the architectural decision-making. Among other alternatives, we have chosen to use ontologies to represent the AK as done also by [13]. Ontologies have been successfully used for knowledge representation in other domains (e.g., software engineering, artificial intelligence, semantic web, biomedicine, etc.) and they offer other advantages such as reasoning and learning techniques ready to be applied (e.g., we could add new ADs using case-based reasoning techniques).

We have designed Arteon (Architectural and Technological Ontology) to manage and reuse AK. A first overview of Arteon appears in [4]. In that paper, the focus was on the part of the ontology related to the structural elements (i.e., components and their relationships). Our focus here is on a different part of the ontology, the part related to ADs. Arteon was designed following the principles stated by Gruber [14], Guarino [15] and Evermann [16]: clarity, coherence, extendibility, minimal encoding bias, minimal ontological commitment, identity criterion, basic taxonomy, and cognitive quality.

Most of the concepts that appear in this ontology are adopted from the software architecture community. They are defined carefully, and whenever possible we simply adhere to the most widely-accepted definition (according to the minimal ontological commitment design principle).

Arteon has been diagrammed using UML class diagrams to present and describe Arteon’s concepts. UML has not been a limitation to express any concept or relationship, thus the minimal encoding bias principle has not been jeopardized [14]. We also found in the literature many approaches that use UML to diagram the ontologies (e.g., [17] [18]) and there is also the possibility to convert the UML representation of the ontology into OWL [19].

The typical benefits of materializing AK are sharing and reusing this knowledge in different software projects and/or communities of architects. But in this paper we go one step forward. We propose to use AK to guide and facilitate the architects’ decision-making and, eventually, bring more reliability to this process by surfacing new alternatives that were not initially considered by the architect. To apply the learning and reasoning techniques necessary to walk this step, we need to be able to formalize this knowledge. In this section we provide some examples of formalizations of this knowledge to show its feasibility.

Arteon is divided into four modules: Req-module, representing software requirements knowledge; R-module, reasoning and decision-making knowledge (the module presented in this paper); SE-module, structural elements, views and frameworks knowledge (presented in [4]); and MDD-module, Model-Driven Development (MDD) related knowledge. Although interconnected (see Figure 2), the four modules are loosely coupled and highly cohesive enough to be reused
separately. In particular, the Req-module is related to the R-module through a relationship between software requirements (functional and non-functional) and constraints. The relationship between the R-module and the SE-module is done through a specialization of the Decisional Element concept (see Section 4.1) into a full classification of these elements. The relationship between the SE-module and the MDD-module consists of the selection of the correct MDD transformations to apply. The last link is necessary for our vision in software architecture design [20], which is out of the scope of this paper.

In Figure 3 we show the principal concepts of the R-module and their relationships. The rest of the section provide details of R-module.

4.1 Decisional Element

A Decisional Element is an elemental part of an architecture the architect can decide upon, i.e., the object of decisions. This concept is specialized in the SE-module, so it is left unreified in the R-Module. The different types of Decisional Element proposed in the SE-module are: architectural styles (e.g., 3-layers), style variations (e.g., 3-layers with data replication), components (e.g., persistence layer), and technology (e.g., Hibernate). Of course, this is not the unique possible specialization of this concept. Being a modular ontology makes it is easy to design and use a different specialization hierarchy for the Decisional Element, which is aligned with the extendibility ontology design principle.

4.2 Decision

According to RUP [21], software architecture is the “selection of the structural elements and their interfaces by which a system is composed, behavior as specified in collaborations among those elements, composition of these structural and behavioral elements into larger subsystem, architectural style that guides this organization”. This definition is about making ADs, structural and behavioral, both classified as existence decisions by Krutchen et al. [3].

In Arteon, the decision concept is very similar to the existence decision concept. Decisions are actions over Decisional Elements where the action determines the effect of the decision. Due to the extendibility design principle, we have not closed the ontology to a predefined set of actions, but possible actions could be, for example, the ones proposed in [3]: use, the Decisional Element will be in the architecture, and ban, the Decisional Element will not be in the architecture.
4.3 Constraint

Constraints can be imposed by software requirements or by Decisional Elements (the concept of requirement belongs to the Req-module of Arteon). Constraints coming from requirements are normally described in natural language (e.g., “the system shall be developed in C++”), sometimes using templates (e.g., Volere [22]) or a specialized language (e.g., temporal logic, the NFR Framework [23], etc.). Constraints coming from Decisional Elements are formalized as part of the AK (e.g., when the architect uses a technology that is only available for a particular platform, s/he is restricting the architecture to this platform).

Independently from the origin, we distinguish two kinds of constraints:

**Restriction** A constraint that directly imposes one or more ADs. For example, “SQL Server” DBMS needs “Windows” operating system.

**Condition** A constraint that specifies the valid values for attributes (see 4.4).

E.g., if we only want to use Open-Source Software (OSS) software, the condition limit the “license” attribute to OSS licenses (e.g. GPL, LGPL, BSD).

In Quark constraints are used to prioritize ADs (e.g., in the previous example OSS technologies would have higher priority than other technologies).

In order to be able to reason with these constraints they must be formalized as evaluable expressions. Again, the ontology does not commit to any particular proposal, but we provide an example expressed as a Context Free Grammar (CFG) [24] (see Figure 4). For simplification, we included extra notation in the CFG: `<concept>` means one valid instance of the concept and `<symbol>` means a terminal symbol. Also, for simplification, we did not include semantic rules.
The Quark method

RestrictionSet → Restriction (LogicOp Restriction)*
Restriction → Action [DecisionalElement]
Action → <use> | <ban>
ConditionSet → Condition (LogicOp Condition)*
Condition → ComparativeCond | ConjunctiveCond
ComparativeCond → [Attribute] CompOp [Value]
ConjunctiveCond → [Attribute] ConjOp [Value]+
LogicOp → <and> | <or>
CompOp → <greater_than> | <lower_than> | <equal_to>
ConjOp → <includes> | <excludes>

Fig. 4. CFG to formalize constraints.

(e.g., “the data type of the value should be the same of the data type of the attribute”). Depending on the expressiveness of the formalization, constraints could contain logic, comparative and conjunctive expressions, but expressiveness impacts negatively on the complexity of the reasoning system.

4.4 Attribute

An Attribute is an “inherent property or characteristic of an entity that can be distinguished quantitatively or qualitatively by human or automated means” [25]. In Arteon we differentiate two kinds of attributes:

Element Attribute An attribute of a Decisional Element. E.g., the values of the “license” attribute are the names of the licenses. Only Decisional Elements for which the license is relevant will have a value (e.g., technologies).

Quality Attribute An attribute that characterizes some aspect of the software quality. For example, ISO/IEC 25000 [25] defines a hierarchy of QAs (named “characteristics” in the standard: functionality, reliability, usability, efficiency, maintainability, and portability).

In this case, we also followed the extendibility principle by leaving the attributes customizable. Initially, we thought to propose a set of attributes, the most generic and independent of domain, but when we tried, we found out that domain-specific quality models may be more adequate in each situation (e.g., the S-Cube quality model [26] is specific for SOA) and that the element attributes are uncountable, and even worse, the same information can be modeled with different attributes (e.g., for the license information, we may have a boolean attribute, true when is a OSS license and false otherwise, or as before have an attribute with a list of licenses). We opted to let the domain expert decide which attributes are convenient in each case, but we acknowledge that more research is needed in order to make this knowledge reusable from one project to another.
5 Example

Since the complete architectural decision-making of a software architecture is too big to be included in a paper, the present example will focus only on one aspect of the architecture, the DBMS. The example is mostly about technologies, but the same idea can be also applied, e.g., to the selection of architectural patterns.

Following the Quark method, first the architect will identify the software requirements that are relevant to the architecture. For this example, the requirements are: (R1) the software system shall keep the information about clients and providers, (R2) the software system shall be developed using OSS whenever possible, and (R3) the software system shall have backup systems for reliability.

5.1 Specification Activity

Once software requirements are identified, the software architect should translate them into QRs and constraints. From R1, the architect may deduce that the project is an information system, so a DBMS will be required. R2 sets a constraint on the technologies used to be OSS. R3 sets constraints for backup facilities, and also mentions that reliability is a desired QA. Using the formalization presented in Section 4, the specification will be: Use DBMS; “License” includes \{“GPL”, “LGPL”, “BSD”, etc.\}; “Backup facility” equal “yes”; and “Reliability” greater than “average”.

5.2 Decision Inference Activity

Next, depending on the AK we have in the ontology and a prioritization criteria, an ordered list of ADs will be generated. For this example, the AK is based on the information published in the Postgres Online Journal [27] and the prioritization criteria is to give higher priority to ADs that satisfy more constraints and improve the selected QAs. The resulting list of ADs (with justifications) is:

1. The AD of using MySQL 5 is offered because it is OSS. There is no information available about backup facilities in MySQL. MySQL is preferred because it supports more OSS technologies. Using MySQL has neutral impact in reliability because ACID compliance depends on the configuration.
2. The AD of using PostgreSQL 8.3 is offered because it is OSS. There is no information available about back-up facilities in PostgreSQL. There are few OSS technologies with support for PostgreSQL. Using Postgre-SQL improves reliability because it is ACID compliant.
3. The AD of using SQL Server 2005 is offered because it satisfies the backup facility condition. SQL Server is not OSS. There are few OSS technologies with support for SQL Server. SQL Server will require a Windows operating system. Using SQL server improves reliability because it is ACID compliant.
5.3 Decision-Making Activity

In the Decision-Making activity, the architect, for example, will decide to use MySQL 5 (the AD with higher priority) as the implementing technology for the DBMS component. But as said before in this paper, the architect may prefer to use PostgreSQL, even it is not the highest-ranked AD. The important point is that the architect is able to make informed ADs, and, eventually, new ADs that were unknown to her/him are taken into consideration.

5.4 Architectural Refinement Activity

After the Decision-Making activity the architectural design will continue with new iterations, where the AD of using MySQL will impact, e.g., in the selection of other technologies that are compatible with MySQL. This information will appear during the Refinement activity as dependencies and incompatibilities.

6 Analysis

In this section we present two comparisons: Quark and a general model of architectural design methods [28]; and, Arteon and Kruchten’s ontology [3].

The Hofmeister et al. general model of architectural design methods [28] have three activities: architectural analysis, “serves to define the problems the architecture must solve”; architectural synthesis, “proposes architecture solutions to a set of architectural significant requirements”; and architectural evaluation, “ensures that the architectural design decisions made are the right ones”.

In Quark, architectural analysis is covered with the Specification activity, architectural synthesis is covered with the Decision Inference activity, and architectural evaluation is covered with the Decision-Making activity, but there are two differences between Quark and the general approach of architectural design proposed by Hofmeister. First, the general approach does not consider iterative methods, which is why we have an extra activity in our method. The second difference is that Hofmeister’s general approach deals with complete architectural solutions, while Quark works at decisional level. In our exploratory studies we have detected that architects will not trust a support system that generates full architectural solutions without their intervention.

Kruchten’s ontology of ADs [3] proposes three kinds of decisions: existence decisions, “states that some element / artifact will positively show up, i.e., will exist in the systems’ design or implementation”; property decisions, “states an enduring, overarching trait or quality of the system. Property decisions can be design rules or guidelines or design constraints, as some trait that the system will not exhibit”; and executive decisions, “do not relate directly to the design elements or their qualities, but are driven more by the business environment, and affect the development process, the people, the organization, and to a large extend the choices of technologies and tools”.

In Arteon, Existence decisions, as mentioned in Section 4.2, are represented as the Decision concept and its actions. The two other kinds of decisions are
also represented in the ontology, but not in an evident way. Property decisions are represented in Arteon as the resulting decisions from conditions over QAs or element attributes, for example, all the ADs made because of the condition to have OSS license. Executive decisions are represented in Arteon as the resulting ADs imposed by restrictions that come from the software requirements, in particular the requirements unrelated to the software quality, for example, a software requirement says that the DBMS should be Oracle, because the architect’s company has a deal with Oracle to only use its products.

7 Implementation

ArchiTech (see the video at www.upc.edu/gessi/architech/ for a running example) [29] is the proof of concept of the Quark method and the Arteon ontology. The ArchiTech tool is capable to manage the AK as it is defined in the Arteon ontology (ArchiTech-CRUD), and to assist architects in architectural decision-making as described in the Quark method (ArchiTech-DM).

ArchiTech-CRUD This subsystem provides facilities to operate with the AK. The CRUD operations are specialized for four different types of knowledge: Architectural element (e.g., architectural styles -SOA, layered, etc.-, components -services, packages, etc.-, technologies -DBMS, RESTful vs. W3C, etc.-); Properties (e.g., the property License may be used to classify and reason about OSS technologies); Quality models (e.g., the S-Cube quality model to design SOA systems [30]); ADs (e.g., which architectural style to apply or which DBMS to choose). These concepts are defined in [4]. ArchiTech-CRUD also provide an embedded database, and an option to export the stored AK.

ArchiTech-DM This subsystem uses Quark method as described in this paper with few limitations and implementation decisions: the Architectural Specification activity only supports the goal kind of QRs, but restrictions are fully supported. For the Decision Inference activity we decided to use simulated annealing [31] as the inference mechanism.

One extra feature is that using this tool the architect can monitor the overall QAs evaluation while making ADs. This feature gives to the architect a clear notion of what is happening at any moment.

8 Conclusions, limitations, and future work

One of the most known Kruchten’s statements is “the life of a software architect is a long (and sometimes painful) succession of suboptimal decisions made partly in dark” [32]. The lack of knowledge is one of the reasons to produce suboptimal decisions. For example, the architect may not know all the effects of using some technology or architectural pattern: it may need of other components to work correctly (e.g., some of them may be incompatible with other ADs), it may have unexpected effects in the overall evaluation of some QAs (e.g., lowers the
resource utilization efficiency). Also, the lack of knowledge may cause a worse situation when some alternative is not considered because it is unknown to the architect. To improve this situation we presented Quark, a method to assist software architects in architectural decision-making.

About the limitations of the presented work, one of the major problems we have to deal with is the amount of knowledge required. Our position is that the best way to acquire and maintain such amount of knowledge is making architects active participants of its acquisition and maintenance. A possible way to achieve this participation is using networks of knowledge, which have been successful in other areas (e.g., Stack Overflow for software developers). Other techniques that have been considered to acquire and maintain this knowledge are knowledge reuse and knowledge learning, but both have drawbacks, for example, reusing knowledge you may find out that a solution that provides high security in a information system may not be secure enough for a critical system, and in order to use learning techniques first is necessary to have a big source of knowledge.

With regard to the future work we envisioned the transformation of the resulting set of ADs into models for the architectural views, and then into the actual software architecture implementation [20]. We also plan to validate the method both using experiments and some real case study.
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