



## Identifying modularity improvement opportunities in goal-oriented requirements models

#### Catarina Gralha, Miguel Goulão, João Araújo

CITI, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal acg.almeida@campus.fct.unl.pt {mgoul, joao.araujo}@fct.unl.pt

## Roadmap



## Introduction

## Introduction

- Goal-oriented Requirements Engineering (GORE)
  - Great impact and importance in the Requirements Engineering community
  - Provide expressive model elements for requirements elicitation and analysis
  - *i\**, KAOS, GRL
- The models can quickly become very complex
- Manage the accidental complexity of the models is a challenge
- Identify refactoring opportunities to improve the modularity of those models, and consequently reduce their complexity

#### Objectives

- To provide a tool supported metrics suite, targeted to the measurement and analysis of the complexity of *i*\* models, for identifying modularity refactoring opportunities
- The identification of such opportunities can be useful during development, where a better modularization can lead to a sounder distribution of responsibilities among the system components
  - If performed in a timely fashion, this is likely to contribute to relevant costs savings through the reduction of the model's accidental complexity
  - Refactoring opportunities identification is also an asset in the context of preventive maintenance, as a facilitator for future requirements changes

## The Approach



#### About the metrics suite

- The metrics suite is integrated in an eclipse-based *i*\* editor, so that metrics can be computed during the requirements modelling process, whenever the requirements engineer requests them
- The metrics are defined using the Object Constraint Language (OCL) upon the *i*\* metamodel
- This makes our metrics set easily extensible, as improving the metrics set can be done by adding new OCL metrics definitions
- Actor's boundaries are a key mechanism in the metrics suite proposed here. Our goal is to use these metrics to leverage the modularity of *i*\* models.

## *i*\* Framework

## *i*\* Framework

Approach focused on the system stakeholders and in their relations

Developed for modelling and reasoning about organizational environments



## i\* Metamode



## **Metrics**

## **Complexity Metrics Definition**



## Metrics Definition for Q1

<b>Q1</b> - How complex is the model, concerning the number of actors and elements?	
Name	NAct – Number of Actors
Informal definition	Number of actors in the SD/SR model
Formal definition	<pre>context ISTAR def:NAct():Integer = self.hasNode -&gt; select(n:Node   n.oclIsKindOf(Actor)) -&gt; size()</pre>
Name	NElem – Number of Elements
Informal definition	Number of elements in the SD/SR model
Formal definition	<pre>context ISTAR def:NElem():Integer = self.NEOAB() + self.NEIAB()</pre>
Requires	<b>NEOAB</b> – Number of Elements Outside Actors' Boundary <b>NEIAB</b> – Number of Elements Inside Actors' Boundary

## Some Metrics Definition for Q2

Q2 - Does an actor have too much responsibility in the model?	
Name	NEA – Number of Elements of an Actor
Informal definition	Number of elements inside an actor's boundary in the SR model
Formal definition	<pre>context Actor def:NEA():Integer = self.hasElement -&gt; select(e : Element   e.oclIsKindOf(Element)) -&gt; size()</pre>
Name	AvgNEA – Average Number of Elements of an Actor
Informal definition	Average number of elements inside an actor's boundary in the SR model
Formal definition	<pre>context ISTAR pre:self.NAct() &gt; 0 context ISTAR def:AvgNEA():Real = self.NEA() / self.NAct()</pre>
Requires	<b>NEA –</b> <i>Number of Elements of an Actor</i> <b>NAct –</b> <i>Number of Actors</i>

#### **Tool Prototype**



## **Evaluation**

#### **Case Studies**



HC: Health Care



HPA: Health Protection Agency





**NATS:** National Air Traffic Services

NO: Newspaper Office

#### Number of Actors and Elements in the System



#### **Goal Decomposition per Actor**



HC has a higher ratio than all the other systems, which have very similar ratios.

This may suggest that HC could be an interesting candidate for refactoring.

In contrast, we note that the most complex system, in terms of size, has the lowest element/actor density, suggesting a good overall modularity

#### Number of Decompositions of a Goal



#### Number of Decompositions of a Softgoal



*Civil ATCO* may have too many responsibilities. A typical refactoring would be to decompose the actor into *sub-actors* 

#### Number of Decompositions of a Task



It may also be the case that the requirements engineer may over-decompose these goals, softgoals, or tasks, by following a functional decomposition strategy, leading to poor modularity. This is similar to the *functional decomposition* anti-pattern

## **Conclusions and Future Work**

## Conclusions

- The questions allow evaluating the complexity of a model as a whole
- Evaluating complexity at early stages allows avoiding eventual extra costs
  - during the later stages of software development
  - during software maintenance and evolution
- The realization that the modularity of a requirements model can be improved can trigger requirements refactoring opportunities
- The results of these metrics reveal a pattern of usage in goal modelling concerning modularity of those models

## Future Work

- Replicate this evaluation with other *i*\* models
- Extend the metrics set to cover other model quality attributes
- Identify thresholds for suggesting merging and decomposing model elements
- Conduct an experiment with requirements engineers
  - Assess the extent to which those thresholds are correlated with an increased difficulty in *i*\* model comprehension
- Define and apply refactoring patterns for GORE models

• Implement different views and analyse each view separately

# Thank you.

Questions?