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Software Architecture Evaluation

- Software architecture is a key part of many of our largest programs
  - *Primary carrier of system qualities, such as performance, modifiability, and security*
  - *Problems expensive to fix in time and money, especially if caught late*

- Project Goals
  - *Development of a framework of evaluation dimensions tailored for Space and Space–related programs*
  - *Document methodologies successfully used across acquisition phases*
  - *Provide guidance/training for teams conducting software architecture evaluation*
  - *Develop a tool that supports workflow for performing evaluations*
  - *Keep the emphasis on important features to evaluate, not evaluation process*
  - **Output of an evaluation:**
    - Identification of specific strengths and weaknesses
    - Actionable recommendations
Why a Framework?

• Ensure comprehensive coverage
  – Standardize assessment dimensions
  – Ensure attention to all key areas of importance
  – Guide partitioning of evaluation work
  – Avoid reinventing the wheel

• Maintain Objectivity
  – Make evaluation repeatable across teams and evaluations

• Leverage Aerospace corporate experience
  – Communicate software architecture expertise
  – Communicate an (increasing amount) of domain-specific guidance

• Maintain Evaluation Focus
  – Support drill-down to specific issues while maintaining “big picture” context

Provides guidance and structure for teams conducting software architecture evaluations
What is the Framework and How is it Applied?

• **At its Core**: A structured collection of 1000+ questions about an Space/Space-related program’s software architecture
  – *Organized as follows:*
    • **Four** top-level categories
      – *Each category contains multiple dimensions (concerns)*
        • Each dimension has a set of evaluation questions
  • Evaluators tailor framework for the target program and evaluation goals
    – *Evaluators select a subset of dimensions/questions*
    – *Questions are tailored for the target program/evaluation*
      • Can include deleting, modifying, and/or adding new questions
  • Method agnostic and complementary with scenario based evaluations
Framework: Categories and Dimensions

Architecture Description
- Architecture Scope
- Architecture Tradeoffs Documentation
- Use of Viewpoints and Views
- Scope of Documentation
- Consistency Across Views
- Use of Description Notations
- Organization and Traceability of Documentation

Architectural Satisfaction of Functionality/Qualities
- Architectural Decisions and Tradeoffs Reflect Program Drivers
- Flowdown of Enterprise/System Architecture to Software Architecture
- Allocation of Requirements to Software Architecture
- Software Architecture Consistency with User Interface
- Software Architecture and Data Architecture are Integrated
- COTS/GOTS Appropriateness
- Reuse Appropriateness
- Integration of Reuse into Software Architecture
- Openness and Platform independence
- External Interfaces
- Modularity and Layered Architecture
- Scalability
- Flexibility
- Timeliness and Performance
- Reliability and Availability
- Security / Information Assurance
- Manageability
- Technology Readiness
- Usability
- Safety
- Extendibility/Extensibility
- Survivability

Architecture Development/Evolution Methodology
- Software Architecture Process
- Personnel and Skill Mix
- Communication and Interaction
- Tools

Note: Many of these dimensions drill down into specific domains

These questions are tailored into program-specific questions to address key requirements and important characteristics the architecture needs to deliver.
Example Questions

Category: “Arch. Satisfaction of Functionality/Qualities”
Dimension: “Modularity and Layered Architecture”

1. Is there a clear and reasonable separation of concerns (for example, application from infrastructure, user interface details from application behavior, hardware/operating system dependencies, middleware & commercial software dependencies)?

2. Are modular design principles (high cohesion among components, weak coupling & well-defined interfaces between components) incorporated to allow software to be functionally partitioned into scalable components?

3. What is the adopted layering model?
   - Are there any layer violations? Are the risks of these violations and adequate mitigations plans identified?

4. Is a layering model used consistently throughout the architecture (an example of inconsistency: some permit a component to use services at any lower layer, some permit use of services only at the next layer)?

Sample Requirement Addressed:
“The system shall be modifiable and flexible and expandable”

These questions are tailored into program-specific questions to address key requirements and important characteristics the architecture needs to deliver.
Using the Framework in a Software Architecture Evaluation

• The framework does **not** define an evaluation process
  – **Though usage guidance is provided based on experience**
• Tailor the framework to account for:
  – **Different evaluation goals**
  – **Number of evaluators & their expertise levels**
  – **Specific domains to be investigated**
    • Space? Ground? Launch?
  – **Program lifecycle stage**
  – **Architectural information available**
    • Documents only? Access to architects and system experts?
Tool Support: “Evalica” Evaluation Tool

Motivation

• Organize a growing list of 1000+ questions
  – With complex relationships:
    • Parent-child: Parents set context for children
    • Dimensions: Each question in exactly one dimension (i.e., concern)
    • Multi-domain: Some questions pertain to one or more NSS-related domains
  – Permit users to rapidly subset questions by multiple criteria

• Provide a clearinghouse for evaluators to
  – Tailor the questions to their evaluation
  – Capture answers and track the progress of an evaluation

• Generic enough to be used for other types of evaluations

Evalica provides tool support for evaluations
Tool Support: “Evalica” Evaluation Tool

Demonstration

Evalica does not define an evaluation process
Evalica supports the evaluation processes
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Evaluation-Specific Options

Current Evaluation: Architecture Evaluation [Rangifer Tarandus]
- Show Only Evaluation-Relevant Questions
- Show Answers
- Show Ratings
- Show Assessments
- Show Evidence Produced
- Show Notes

Set Filters

Generate Reports

This feature allows you to generate a variety of reports, including both questions and responses to those questions for the current evaluation. Set the filters using the controls above, submit, and click the link that appears below to download the report in HTML format.

Click Here to Download Report For Current Filter Settings
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