A survey of self-management in dynamic software architecture specifications

Conference or Workshop Item

How to cite:

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

© 2004 Association for Computing Machinery

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher’s website:
http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1145/1075405.1075411

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online’s data policy on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk
A Survey of Self-Management in Dynamic Software Architecture Specifications

Jeremy S. Bradbury*, James R. Cordy†‡, Juergen Dingel‡, Michel Wermelinger§
§School of Computing, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada
†Departamento de Informática, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Caparica, Portugal
‡Computing Department, The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK.
§Istituto per le Tecnologie della Informazione—ISTI-CNR, Pisa, Italy.
*This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

ABSTRACT
As dynamic software architecture use becomes more widespread, a variety of formal specification languages have been developed to gain a better understanding of the foundations of this type of software evolutionary change. In this paper we survey 14 formal specification approaches based on graphs, process algebras, logic, and other formalisms. Our survey will evaluate the ability of each approach to specify self-managing systems as well as the ability to address issues regarding expressiveness and scalability. Based on the results of our survey we will provide recommendations on future directions for improving the specification of dynamic software architectures, specifically self-managed architectures.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
D.2.1 [Software Engineering]: Requirements/Specifications—languages; D.2.9 [Software Engineering]: Management—software configuration management; D.2.11 [Software Engineering]: Software Architectures

Keywords
dynamic software architecture, architectural formalism, dynamism, run-time evolution, specification, self-management

1. INTRODUCTION
Dynamic software architectures modify their architecture and enact the modifications during the system’s execution [18]. This behavior is most commonly known as run-time evolution or dynamism. Self-managing architectures are a specific type of dynamic software architectures. We define a system that enacts architectural changes at run-time as having a self-managing architecture if the system not only implements the change internally but also initiates, selects, and assesses the change itself without the assistance of an external user. Programmed dynamism [10], self-organising architectures [16, 12], self-repairing systems [23], and self-adaptive software [21] are all examples of self-managing architectures. Programmed dynamism is an early type of dynamism in which a fixed change is conditionally triggered by the system. The other examples listed support more advanced notions of self-management in architectural reconfiguration.

Dynamic software architectures and specifically dynamic components have been identified as “challenging in terms of correctness, robustness, and efficiency” [24]. This is especially true for self-managing architecture since systems that are self-managed have to implement the initiation and selection of a change. Conversely, user-managed architectures usually exhibit ad-hoc change [10] in which the initiation and selection occur external to the software, thus simplifying the development.

Formal specification is one way to support the development of correct and robust dynamic software architectures. In this paper we present a survey of 14 dynamic software architecture specification approaches. Our goal is to focus on the ability of each approach to specify self-managing architectures. First, we determine if each specification approach supports our definition of a self-managing architecture. Second, we evaluate each approach with respect to the expressiveness of the approach in specifying different types of change and different levels of change from a fixed selection approach to an unconstrained approach. Third, we compare the scalability of the approaches to specify decentralized management schemes which are more likely in large-scale systems. After evaluating all of the specification approaches we use the results to make recommendations on how formal specification approaches for dynamic software systems in general, and self-managing in particular, can be improved.

Related work to our survey includes several papers that have surveyed Architecture Description Languages (ADLs) and provided broad comparisons [6, 18]. The survey in [6] compared ADLs on attributes related to scope of language, expressive power, tool maturity, and others. The survey in [18] compared ADLs in terms of their ability to model components, connectors and configuration as well as tool support for such things as analysis and refinement. Our work differs from previous work in that we consider only formal specification approaches and provide a narrower comparison, focusing on the ability of each approach to specify self-managing architectures. The previous approaches have not focused on self-managing architectures. In fact, only the survey in [18] even considers run-time evolution in its evaluation.

In Section 2 we will provide an overview of formal specification for dynamic software architecture including some details regarding the 14 specification approaches surveyed. In Section 3 we
Table 1: Support for structure, behavior, and reconfiguration in formal specification approaches for dynamic software architectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Component Representation</th>
<th>Architectural Structure</th>
<th>Architectural Element Behavior</th>
<th>Architectural Reconfiguration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graph</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Métayer approach</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>context-free graph grammar</td>
<td>graph (formally defined as a multiset)</td>
<td>nodes of a graph and a CSP like behavior specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch et al. approach</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>context-free graph grammar</td>
<td>hypergraph</td>
<td>edges of a graph with CCS labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taentzer et al. approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>distributed graph (network graph)</td>
<td>local graph for each network graph node and local transformations between local graphs</td>
<td>edges of a graph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COmUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Categorical diagram</td>
<td>a program in COmUNITY (a UNITY-like language)</td>
<td>a star-shaped configuration of programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAM</td>
<td>creation CHAM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>molecule</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Algebra</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Wright</td>
<td>implicit graph representation (components and connectors are nodes)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ports (interface) + computation (behavior)</td>
<td>roles (interface) + glue (behavior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Programing language + component specification of comm. objects</td>
<td>support for simple bindings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDA</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>interface specification, composition and attachment specification (if composite)</td>
<td>attachments at top level components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiLab</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>components with ports, instances of other components and constraints</td>
<td>support for simple bindings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerel</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>interface in Gerel language and behavior in a programming language</td>
<td>defined by bind operation in configuration components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguirre-Maltauf approach</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>class with attributes, actions and read variables</td>
<td>association consisting of participants and synchronization connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCL</td>
<td>implicit graph representation (defined by set of state schemas in Z)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>state schema in Z</td>
<td>connection between ports of components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>only supports the C2 arch. style</td>
<td>implicit graph representation (defined by Architecture Description Language (ADL))</td>
<td>element with top and bottom interface and behavior (defined by Interface Definition Language (IDL))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2ADEL</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>interface with top and bottom interface (plus other sublanguages for behavior)</td>
<td>Architecture Modification Language (AML)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPIDE</td>
<td>implicit graph representation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>broadcast connection rule ((\triangleright)) or pipe ((\Rightarrow))</td>
<td>where statement or execution architecture events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

will evaluate the ability of each specification approach to support self-management and address expressiveness and scalability. The information presented in this section was gathered from published research papers and our own experience using each approach. Finally, we conclude and discuss future work in Section 4.

2. FORMAL SPECIFICATION

Formal approaches to dynamic software architectures involve the specification of the architectural structure of a system, the architectural reconfiguration of a system, and usually the behavior of a system. The formal approaches to specifying dynamic software architectures that we consider are divided into four categories: graph-based approaches, process algebra approaches, logic-based approaches, and other approaches.

**Graph-Based Approaches.** A natural way to specify software architectures and architectural styles is to use a graph grammar to represent the style and a graph to represent a specific system's architecture. Furthermore, a natural way to specify reconfiguration in a dynamic architecture is to use graph rewriting rules. We include the following graph-based approaches in our survey: the Le Métayer approach [19, 20], the Hirsh et al. approach [13], the Taentzer et al. approach [25], Cosurfury approach [28, 29], and Chemical Abstract Machine (CHAM) approach [27].

**Process Algebra Approaches.** Process algebras are commonly used to study concurrent systems. Processes in the concurrent system are specified in an algebra and a calculus is used to verify the specification. A variety of process algebras exist including the Calculus of Communicating Systems (CCS), Communicating Sequential Processes (CSP), and the \(\pi\)-calculus. We consider four process algebra approaches in this paper: Dynamic Wright [2], Dar-
3. SUPPORT FOR SELF-MANAGEMENT

All dynamic architectural changes have four steps (see Figure 1): initiation of change (➀), selection of architectural transformation (➂), implementation of reconfiguration (➃), and assessment of architecture after reconfiguration (➄).

We defined a self-managing architecture as an architecture in which the entire change process occurs internally. We determine which specification approaches support self-management by considering if the initiation of the change occurs internal to the software. In all of the approaches, if the initiation occurs internally then the selection and other steps of the change process can also be specified internally. Internal initiation usually involves monitors that provide the run-time information on which self-management decisions are based. Monitors are not specified explicitly in the surveyed approaches.

An example of an approach that supports internal initiation is the Le Métayer approach which provides this support through side conditions in the rewriting rules. For example, consider the rule given in [20]

\[ C(c), c.\text{leave}=\text{true}, CR(c, a), CA(a, c) \rightarrow \emptyset \]

which removes a component c and two connectors CR and CA. The side condition c.\text{leave}=\text{true} in this rule refers to a public variable \text{leave} in a component c being true. The rewriting rule can only be applied when this side condition is satisfied.

Of the 14 specification approaches surveyed, we evaluated each approach to see if it supported internal initiation, external initiation (e.g., external user), or both. 11 of the approaches explicitly allowed for internal initiation (see Table 2). In all of the tables in this paper we distinguish between criteria that are supported by the specification explicitly (●), supported externally by a tool or infrastructure (○), not supported (□), support unknown (?), and not applicable (+). We include the notion of a criterion being not applicable because not every specification approach can be classified perfectly using our criteria. We also include support unknown because despite our best efforts we were occasionally unable to discern how all of the approaches fit. For example, we were unable to determine the location of the initiation of the change process in the Taentzer et al. approach. In Sections 3.1 and 3.2 we will only discuss the approaches that explicitly support internal initiation since these are approaches that satisfy our definition of self-management. Details regarding the approaches that have been omitted can be found in [4].

### 3.1 Expressiveness

Our definition of a self-managing architecture includes systems with very limited forms of self-management. However, in many systems increased expressiveness is desirable. The ability of a system to manage its own architecture is, in general, limited by the types of changes it can make and the freedom to choose the appropriate change. We will now survey the expressiveness provided by different specification approaches in the context of these limitations.

#### 3.1.1 Types of Change

The types of change that a self-managing system can make are limited at the architectural level by the reconfiguration operations that are available. For example, if a system can only add connectors but not components it is limited in the ways it addresses reconfiguration needs. In the context of change type we consider the ability of each approach to specify basic reconfiguration operations (the addition and removal of components and connectors) and composite reconfiguration operations (see Table 3).

Our comparison shows that the majority of approaches support all of the basic change operations. For example, Rapide has one execution architecture event type for each of the basic operations:

![Figure 1: Change process in a self-managing architecture](image-url)

*The change process shown above has the same order of steps given in [3]. However, it is also possible to vary this order, for example, to conduct assessment during selection (➂) as well as before the implementation of the change (➃).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Métayer approach</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch et al. approach</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taentzer et al. approach</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAM</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Wright</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLar</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerel</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguirre-Maibaum approach</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c2ADEL</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPIDE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Change initiation support*
Table 3: Reconfiguration operations support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Reconfiguration Operations</th>
<th>Composite Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation Constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Addition</td>
<td>Support Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Removal</td>
<td>Support Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector Addition</td>
<td>Support Iteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector Removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Le Métayer approach
COMMUNITY
CHAM

Dynamic Weight
Darwin
LEDA
PLar

Gerei
Aguirre-Malbaum approach
ZCL

Onur
RANDE

Approaches that did not support all of the basic operations include two of the process algebra approaches (Darwin, LEDA) that do not allow for the removal of architectural elements. The limitation in these approaches appears to be a result of high-level design decisions, not limitations of the underlying formalism. For example, Darwin was originally designed as a configuration language to be used for distributed systems and the removal of components in such a system can still occur at the programming language level.

In composite reconfiguration operations we consider not only the ability to add or remove subsystems or groups of architectural elements but also the constructs that can be used in specifying the operation (e.g., sequencing, choice, and iteration). Almost all of the approaches considered provide support for composite operations. However, only a few of the approaches provide full support for composite operation constructs such as sequencing, choice, and iteration. The scripts used in CosmUsrry and Gerei both provide these constructs. Consider, for example, a bank architecture in which connectors link customers (c) to their accounts (a). The following CosmUsrry script uses iteration to replace all VIP connectors (which allow overdrafts) by standard connectors (which do not) between a given account and the owners of the account.

```
script RestoreStandard
  prv i: record(c:Customer; co:VIP)
  for i in match {c:Customer; co:VIP | co(c,a)} loop
    remove i.co;
    create standard(i.c, a);
  end loop
end script
```

Table 4: Selection support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Pre-defined</th>
<th>Constrained from Pre-defined set</th>
<th>Unconstrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graph</td>
<td>Le Métayer approach</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAM</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Algebra</td>
<td>Dynamic Weight</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEDA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIlar</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Gerei</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aguirre-Malbaum approach</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZCL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Selection

The ability to select different changes also provides increased expressiveness to self-managing systems. We distinguish between three levels of selection that a specification approach may support:

1. **Pre-defined Selection**: Once a dynamic change has been initiated, a change operation is chosen based on a pre-defined selection made prior to run-time.

2. **Constrained Selection from a Pre-defined Set**: Once a dynamic change has been initiated there is some choice in what operation to use. For example, a set of operations may be defined prior to run-time for a given situation or state. The system, upon reaching the situation, will select the appropriate change operation from the set.

3. **Unconstrained Selection**: Once dynamic change has been initiated there is an unconstrained choice regarding the appropriate change to make.

None of the approaches classified in this paper support unconstrained run-time selection, which provides the greatest level of expressiveness (see Table 4). The selection in most approaches is limited. Specifically, most approaches use a selection approach where one reconfiguration is pre-defined for a given situation. The exceptions include the graph rewriting approaches which allow for random selection of a reconfiguration, namely when multiple left hand sides of change rules match part of the current architecture.

An example of constrained selection from a pre-defined set in which the selection is not based on a non-deterministic choice, can be found in LEDA. Consider the following partial definition of a client-server system (originally given in [5]):

```
component DynamicClientServer |
  interface none;
  composition client: Client;
              server[2]: Server;
  attachments client request(r)<>
     if (server[1].n <= server[2].n)
        then server[1].serve(r);
     else server[2].serve(r);
```

Table 4: Selection support
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Métayer approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAM</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes/Algorithms</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Wright</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PiLaR</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerel</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguirre-Maibaum approach</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Centralized</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAPIDE</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Management support

In the example one client and two servers exist. The client is
attached (<> to one of the two servers based on the result of a
boolean condition.

3.2 Scalability
Due to the growing size and complexity of software systems scalability is an important issue. The management of reconfig-
uration in dynamic software architectures can be either centralized in a specialized component or distributed across components. In
general, a decentralized or distributed approach is more likely to
scale. Currently, the management used in most of the specification approaches is centralized, not distributed (see Table 5). This is pri-
marily because early types of dynamic architectural change such as
ad-hoc and programmed often had centralized management. Newer
definitions of change, as found in self-organising architectures, use
distributed management in order to account for scalability in large-
scale distributed systems [12].

Examples of centralized management can be found in Dynamic
Wright where reconfigurations are specified in a configuror and in
the Le Métayer approach where reconfiguration rewriting rules are
specified in a coordinator. An example of distributed management can be found in the PiLaR language. PiLaR allows for multiple com-
ponents to have constraints which may specify reconfiguration.

Some of the approaches such as Gerel do not specify the man-
agement but instead allow for the management to be determined in
accompanying tools. In fact, one of the earliest approaches to dis-
tributed management was developed for approaches like Gerel [9].
In this approach a distributed management model was developed
that allowed programmed changes to be managed concurrently in a cooperative management setting.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK
In this paper we evaluate the ability of current dynamic software architectures specification approaches to represent self-managing
architectures. The paper surveys 14 approaches to dynamic architec-
tural specification in this context. We should note that it is diffi-
cult to survey all of the 14 approaches in such a small space. Our
goal in this paper is two-fold. On the one hand, we want to pro-
vide all readers with a basic introduction to the challenges and is-
ues faced in specifying self-managing architectures. On the other
hand, for those readers who are familiar with the literature on soft-
ware architecture specification we provide details on the ability of
existing approaches to specify self-management. We are currently
working on a journal version of this paper that will include all of
the details about the approaches omitted from this paper due to space
constraints. The journal version will also include additional classi-
fication dimensions not discussed in this paper.

For each specification approach, we consider basic support for
self-management by evaluating the ability of the approach to spec-
ify systems in which a change is initiated internally. Additionally,
we evaluate each approach in terms of expressiveness (ability to
support multiple change types and selection approaches) and scal-
ability (ability to support distributed management).

Our survey shows that the area of dynamic software architec-
ture specification is well researched. There exist a lot of different
sometimes conflicting notations, concepts, and definitions. Most of
the approaches surveyed do reasonably well at answering questions
dealing with the implementation of the change, such as “Given sys-

tem x, what happens when change y occurs?”

However, a large number of the approaches support only lim-
ited forms of self-management. In the context of expressiveness,
the results of our survey are mixed. On the one hand, many of
the approaches support all of the basic operations as well as some
form of composite operations. On the other hand, many of the ap-
proaches do not allow for more expressive selection to be specified.
Selection is an important step in the dynamic architectural change
process and needs to be better specified to enable more meaning-
ful analysis. In the context of scalability many of the approaches
do not consider distributed management schemes thus limiting the
types and size of systems that can be specified.

To summarize, current approaches do a good job with specifying
basic support for self-managing architectures. However, the ap-
proaches need to be adapted and updated to address the current limi-
tations in terms of both expressiveness and scalability. An interest-
ing example of this kind of work is the recent extension of Darwin.
In [12], the traditional Darwin approach, surveyed in this paper,
is extended by specifying Darwin architectures using a constraint-
based approach in the Alloy modelling language. The extension is
expressive in the selection of appropriate changes, provides scal-
ability by supporting distributed management, and provides auto-
matic analysis using the Alloy constraint analyzer.
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