

Overview of ACE2 Presentations

Thomas A. Alspaugh
Institute for Software Research
University of California, Irvine
31 March 2004

Lt Col Laura Pope

(Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center)

- Better architecture up front => better system
- System architecture, not software architecture
- Architecture should be the model for evaluation
 - Consider operations, maintenance
 - Address issues up front
 - Neither requirements nor code are right level
- Requirements are never adequate
- Addition: scenarios of use that express tests

Dr Joel Sercel

(MILSATCOM Joint Program Office)

- Understanding is important, not architecture
 - Good understanding precedes good architecture
- Architecture = set of constraints on designs
- Choose constraints that are effective
 - in achieving the qualities you need
 - example: invariants aid change management
- Necessary for managing change

Dr Linda Northrop

(SEI)

- SA is structure(s) comprised of
 - software elements
 - their external behaviors
 - the relationships among them
- Architecture is the center of many activities
- Scenarios are more expressive than attributes
- SEI has a number of SA techniques and methods
- All the ACE2 objectives are quality attributes

Dr Peter Hantos

(Aerospace)

- The system is what is important
 - Architecture is just a way to achieve system goals
- An architecture is a dynamic entity that evolves
- Architecture-centric development process covers long list of aspects
- Use cases bind all the core workflows together
- Don't use MIL-STD-1521B

Overall

(1st session)

- What is architecture?
 - set of constraints
 - components, behaviors, relationships
 - ...
- System architecture or software architecture?
- What can architecture do for you? Everything?
- When / how are scenarios useful?
- Good architecture precedes good system
 - What is a good architecture?
 - What precedes a good architecture?

Capt Bryan Berg

(Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center)

- **Architecture: a “string” to perform a contact**
 - ~5 components, their functions, and their interconnections (in terms of SEI defn)
- **COTS components + in-house “glueware”**
 - “glueware” isolated COTS component changes
- **Upgrades difficult (except one case)**
 - No control over COTS component evolution
- **Plan to use industry standards to ease upgrades**

Peter Shames

(JPL)

- UML-based reference architecture for space data systems
- Several views of system
 - each with its own kinds of components and connections
- Its use: describe (model) the system, then reason using the description
- Primarily addresses understandability
 - maintainability, extensibility, executability indirectly

Jim Boegman

(Raytheon)

- Architecture is higher-level view than design
 - architecture above design above implementation
- Requirements at all these levels
- They find architecture (in this definition) is insufficient to assess maintainability, etc.
 - More detail is needed, such as a prototype

Dr Allen Nikora.

Myron Hecht, Douglas Buettner

- Reliability-centric process
- Reliability estimated from testing results
 - Or from pre-testing characteristics such as “churn”
- Can't assess reliability from architecture
- Unreliability indicates inadequate architecture

Overall

- Specific architectures have specific advantages and disadvantages (Berg, Boegman presentations)
 - High-level view insufficient for evaluation
- Reference architecture based on UML
 - A number of views of a system
- Would Pope, Sercel, Northrop, Hantos view any of these things as architectures?
- Reliability the most basic ility?

ACE2's four issues for software architecture (SA)

- SA as basis for *understandability*
 - Architecture provides common terminology and concepts, basis for relating stakeholder viewpoints
- SA as link between req's and detailed implementation
 - Evaluate impact of requirements change -- *maintainability*
 - Provide basis for considering *extensibility*
 - Assess *executability* of requirements
- Architecture is “right level” for considering requirements