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Overview

- Architecture IV&V
- Architecture Analysis Research Elements
  - Architecture Perspectives
    - Topics for analytical investigation
    - Views for improving architecture specifications
  - Architecture Analysis Framework
    - Tailorable set of architecture analysis objectives
    - Methods for accomplishing objectives
Impact of Architecture Phase IV&V

- Architectural issues are a leading source for integration problems.
- Without systematic upfront analysis, these problems are costly to repair.
- Application of complexity, safety, and dependability analysis enables addressing the issues early on.
- Architectural decisions impact what is required of the software.
- Improved architecture specifications reduce software risk and increase IV&V’s ability to validate and verify the software.
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Frameworks

DoDAF 2.0

ATAM

Representation

Evaluation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OV-2 | 3.1.1   | - Operational resource flow description  
- Not complete in current version  
- Map to operational scenarios (also not complete)  
- Hierarchical or mission phase views |
| OV-3 | 3.2     | - Operational resource flow matrix  
- Decomposed by mission phase and needline type  
- Limitations of OV-2 make OV-3 completeness assessment difficult  
- Many TBD |
| OV-5 | 3.4     | - Operational activity model  
- Presented via activity diagrams and flowcharts  
- Some activities (e.g. build process) missing OV-3 antecedent  
- IDEF0 notation is recommended due to more complete activity description  
- More complete set of scenarios recommended |
| SV-1 | 4.1     | - System interface description  
- Systems and interfaces to realize OV-2  
- Levels of specification management in CSADD could be improved |
| SV-2 | 4.2     | - Systems communication description  
- CSADD will require more detail |
| SV-6 | 4.3     | - Systems data exchange matrix  
- Tabular characterization of data form SV-1 and SV-2  
- CSADD contains abridged SV-6 |
CSADD Tailoring Analysis

- CSADD based on DoDAF 1.0
- Some sections explicitly mapped to DoDAF
- Tailored-out views which would help
  - AV-1 Executive Summary
  - AV-2 Integrated dictionary (partially tailored)
  - OV-6 Operational activity sequence & timing
    - Significant weakness
  - SV-4 Systems functionality description
    - Systems version of OV-5
CSADD Compliance with DoDAF 2.0

- Activities replace operational nodes – impacts operational viewpoints
- More hierarchical OV-2 would facilitate traceability analysis
- Adoption of service-oriented approach (SvcV replacing SV) recommended
- Used emergency voice as test case
  - Generally, not enough detail provided
  - Example: emergency voice software not differentiated from primary voice
Verifiability

- Features of the architecture are mapped to requirements, which are then mapped to the verification tests that verify them
  - All components have requirements that are tested
  - All component interfaces have specified requirements that are mapped to verification tests
  - All critical scenarios coverable/covered by test cases
- Technical budgets, budget allocations, and compliance to budgets expressed in observable/measurable terms
- Risks noted for untestable capabilities, services, interactions, and scenarios and a risk mitigation approach using simulation and analysis planned
Managing Levels of Specification

- This perspective is concerned with managing
  - Properties of a system as a whole
  - Properties that are allocated to the parts from which it is composed
- Document descriptions are information subsets (i.e. abstractions) that need to fit in an organized hierarchy
- Assessing levels of specification can:
  - Detect misalignment of levels of specifications (e.g. semantics)
  - Gaps in interfacing stakeholder/developer abstractions (e.g. omissions)
  - Potential system integration issues (e.g. pattern errors)
Levels of Specification and Multiple Objectives

- The primary objectives of a system should leave many degrees of freedom for design open
  - Detect stakeholder biases that introduce artificial constraints on downstream tradeoffs
    - Requirements that bias the problem space
    - Implementations that bias the solution space
- Downstream options are then eliminated on the basis of the secondary objectives of the work system
- In many systems, the primary objectives, secondary objectives, and external constraints are often conflicting
- Objectives, like safety or fault tolerance, can have conflicting implementations (e.g. “do nothing” may be safest!)
Levels of Specification and Safety Example

- When objectives, like safety or fault tolerance, have conflicting implications it was unclear in the CSADD how conflicts were resolved.
- There is a risk that system level requirements like safety may merely be specified as measures of goodness at a component level.
- Need to determine if interpretation of safety is consistent at different levels of specification and among system stakeholders.
- Need to determine if an implementation can compromise a critical objective when mixed with other factors (either critical/non-critical).
  - E.g. scheduling of critical communications over a shared network or writing to a shared database.
**IV&V Architecture Analysis Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completeness</th>
<th>Verifiability</th>
<th>Levels of Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specification completeness</td>
<td>Reuse Analysis</td>
<td>Levels of specification identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Capability Mapping</td>
<td>Interface requirements traceability analysis</td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency mapping analysis</td>
<td>Key driving requirements validation</td>
<td>Evolvability analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical budgets analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison to lower level architecture specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-level requirements mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault management and redundancy analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV&V Techniques

- **Specification Completeness**
  - DoDAF content checklists
- **Levels of Specification Identification**
  - Keyword and phrase pattern search vertically through document tree
- **Scenario analysis**
  - Scenario modeling, and simulation and test
- **Fault Management and Redundancy Analysis**
  - Error propagation analysis and containment
  - Coupling analysis
- **Technical budgets Analysis**
  - Budget identification from ADD and document tree
  - Analyze budget allocation, feasibility
- **Mapping Tasks** (Functional Capability Mapping, Dependency Mapping Analysis, I/F Requirements Traceability Analysis, Top-level Requirements Mapping)
  - Quality function deployment (QFD) matrix
Tool Support Opportunities

- Smart keyword search
- Budget mapping tool
- Scenario visualization and testing
- Tracing tools (implement QFD House of Quality)
Architecture Analysis Tailoring

- Involves selecting project-applicable tasks
- Guided by project manager’s tailoring goals
  - Breadth vs. depth
  - Comprehensive vs. limited
- Driven by many factors
  - Overall system criticality and risk
  - Architecture style (DoDAF, 4+1, etc)
  - Mission type/System type
  - Development approach
  - Development phase
  - Artifact availability and maturity
  - Task dependencies
Summary

- Architecture IV&V essential
- CSADD-inspired ADD improvements
  - Completeness
  - Verifiability
  - Levels of abstraction
- IV&V architecture methodologies
  - Ideal task set covers all aspects of architecture
  - Techniques achieve tasks
  - Tools facilitate and automate techniques