

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Lecture 11: Requirements Modelling

- **A little refresher:**
  - ⊗ What are we modelling?
  - ⊗ Requirements; Systems; Systems Thinking
- **Role of Modelling in RE**
  - ⊗ Why modelling is important
  - ⊗ Limitations of modelling
- **Brief overview of modelling languages**
- **Modelling principles**
  - ⊗ Abstraction
  - ⊗ Decomposition
  - ⊗ Projection
  - ⊗ Modularity

© Easterbrook 2004 2

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Refresher: Definitions

Application Domain Machine Domain

- **Some distinctions:**
  - ⊗ Domain Properties - things in the application domain that are true whether or not we ever build the proposed system
  - ⊗ Requirements - things in the application domain that we wish to be made true by delivering the proposed system
  - ⊗ A specification - a description of the behaviours the program must have in order to meet the requirements
- **Two correctness (verification) criteria:**
  - ⊗ The Program running on a particular Computer satisfies the Specification
  - ⊗ The Specification, in the context of the given domain properties, satisfies the requirements
- **Two completeness (validation) criteria:**
  - ⊗ We discovered all the important requirements
  - ⊗ We discovered all the relevant domain properties

© Easterbrook 2004 3

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Refresher: Systems to model

© Easterbrook 2004 *Source: Adapted from Loucopoulos & Karakostas, 1995, p73* 4

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Refresher: Systems Thinking

© Easterbrook 2004 5

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Modelling...

- **Modelling can guide elicitation:**
  - ↳ It can help you figure out what questions to ask
  - ↳ It can help to surface hidden requirements
    - i.e. does it help you ask the right questions?
- **Modelling can provide a measure of progress:**
  - ↳ Completeness of the models → completeness of the elicitation (?)
    - i.e. if we've filled in all the pieces of the models, are we done?
- **Modelling can help to uncover problems**
  - ↳ Inconsistency in the models can reveal interesting things...
    - e.g. conflicting or infeasible requirements
    - e.g. confusion over terminology, scope, etc
    - e.g. disagreements between stakeholders
- **Modelling can help us check our understanding**
  - ↳ Reason over the model to understand its consequences
    - Does it have the properties we expect?
  - ↳ Animate the model to help us visualize/validate the requirements

© Easterbrook 2004 6

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## RE involves a lot of modelling

- **A model is more than just a description**
  - ↳ it has its own phenomena, and its own relationships among those phenomena.
    - The model is only useful if the model's phenomena correspond in a systematic way to the phenomena of the domain being modelled.
- ↳ **Example:**

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Jackson, 1995, p120-122 7

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## "It's only a model"

- **There will always be:**
  - ↳ phenomena in the model that are not present in the application domain
  - ↳ phenomena in the application domain that are not in the model

- Phenomena not captured in the model**
  - ...ghost writers...
  - ...pseudonyms...
  - ...anonymity...
- Common Phenomena**
  - ...every book has at least one author...
  - ...every book has a unique ISBN...
- Phenomena not true in the world**
  - ...no two people born on same date with same name...

- **A model is never perfect**
  - ↳ "If the map and the terrain disagree, believe the terrain"
  - ↳ Perfecting the model is not always a good use of your time...

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Jackson, 1995, p124-5 8

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Choice of modelling notation

- **natural language**
  - ↳ extremely expressive and flexible
    - useful for elicitation, and to annotate models for readability
  - ↳ poor at capturing key relationships
- **semi-formal notation**
  - ↳ captures structure and some semantics
  - ↳ can perform (some) reasoning, consistency checking, animation, etc.
    - E.g. diagrams, tables, structured English, etc.
  - ↳ mostly visual - for rapid communication with a variety of stakeholders
- **formal notation**
  - ↳ precise semantics, extensive reasoning possible
    - Underlying mathematical model (e.g. set theory, FSMs, etc)
  - ↳ very detailed models (may be more detailed than we need)
    - RE formalisms are for conceptual modelling, hence differ from most computer science formalisms

← UML fits in here

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Loucopoulos & Karakostas, 1995, p72-73 9

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Desiderata for Modelling Notations

- **Implementation Independence**
  - ↳ does not model data representation, internal organization, etc.
- **Abstraction**
  - ↳ extracts essential aspects
    - e.g. things not subject to frequent change
- **Formality**
  - ↳ unambiguous syntax
  - ↳ rich semantic theory
- **Constructability**
  - ↳ can construct pieces of the model to handle complexity and size
  - ↳ construction should facilitate communication
- **Ease of analysis**
  - ↳ ability to analyze for ambiguity, incompleteness, inconsistency
- **Traceability**
  - ↳ ability to cross-reference elements
  - ↳ ability to link to design, implementation, etc.
- **Executability**
  - ↳ can animate the model, to compare it to reality
- **Minimality**
  - ↳ No redundancy of concepts in the modelling scheme
    - i.e. no extraneous choices of how to represent something

© Easterbrook 2004 Source: Adapted from Loucopoulos & Karakostas, 1995, p77 10

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Survey of Modelling Techniques

- **Modelling Enterprises**
  - ↳ Goals & objectives
  - ↳ Organizational structure
  - ↳ Tasks & dependencies
  - ↳ Agents, roles, intentionality
- **Modelling Information & Behaviour**
  - ↳ Information Structure
  - ↳ Behavioral views
    - Scenarios and Use Cases
    - State machine models
    - Information flow
  - ↳ Timing/Sequencing requirements
- **Modelling System Qualities (NFRs)**
  - ↳ All the 'ilities':
    - Usability, reliability, evolvability, safety, security, performance, interoperability, ...

**Organization modelling:**  
i\*, SSM, ISAC  
**Goal modelling:**  
KAOS, CREWS

**Information modelling:**  
E-R, Class Diagrams  
**Structured Analysis:**  
SADT, SSADM, JSD  
**Object Oriented Analysis:**  
OOA, OOSE, OMT, UML  
**Formal Methods:**  
SCR, RSML, Z, Larch, VDM

**Quality tradeoffs:**  
QFD, win-win, AHP,  
**Specific NFRs:**  
Timed Petri nets (performance)  
Task models (usability)  
Probabilistic MTTF (reliability)

© Easterbrook 2004 11

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## the Unified Modelling Language (UML)

- **Third generation OO method**
  - ↳ Booch, Rumbaugh & Jacobson are principal authors
    - Still evolving
    - Attempt to standardize the proliferation of OO variants
  - ↳ Is purely a notation
    - No modelling method associated with it!
    - Was intended as a design notation (some features unsuitable for RE)
  - ↳ Has become an industry standard
    - But is primarily owned by Rational Corp. (who sell lots of UML tools and services)
- **Has a standardized meta-model**
  - ↳ Use case diagrams
  - ↳ Class diagrams
  - ↳ Message sequence charts
  - ↳ Activity diagrams
  - ↳ State Diagrams
  - ↳ Module Diagrams
  - ↳ Platform diagrams

© Easterbrook 2004 12

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Meta-Modelling

- **Can compare modelling schema using meta-models:**
  - ↳ What phenomena does each scheme capture?
  - ↳ What guidance is there for how to elaborate the models?
  - ↳ What analysis can be performed on the models?
- **Example meta-model:**

```

graph TD
    Facts((Facts)) -- modify --> Activities((Activities))
    Facts -- record --> Events((Events))
    Activities <--> |trigger| Events
    subgraph Facts_Text [Propositions about the application domain]
        Facts
    end
    subgraph Activities_Text [Actions inducing change of facts in the application domain]
        Activities
    end
    subgraph Events_Text [State changes in the application domain]
        Events
    end
  
```

© Easterbrook 2004 13

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Modelling principles

→ **Facilitate Modification and Reuse**

- ↳ Experienced analysts reuse their past experience
  - they reuse components (of the models they have built in the past)
  - they reuse structure (of the models they have built in the past)
- ↳ Smart analysts plan for the future
  - they create components in their models that might be reusable
  - they structure their models to make them easy to modify

→ **Helpful ideas:**

- ↳ **Abstraction**
  - strip away detail to concentrate on the important things
- ↳ **Decomposition (Partitioning)**
  - Partition a problem into independent pieces, to study separately
- ↳ **Viewpoints (Projection)**
  - Separate different concerns (views) and describe them separately
- ↳ **Modularization**
  - Choose structures that are stable over time, to localize change
- ↳ **Patterns**
  - Structure of a model that is known to occur in many different applications

© Easterbrook 2004 14

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Modelling Principle 1: Partitioning

→ **Partitioning**

- ↳ captures aggregation/part-of relationship

→ **Example:**

- ↳ goal is to develop a spacecraft
- ↳ partition the problem into parts:
  - guidance and navigation;
  - data handling;
  - command and control;
  - environmental control;
  - instrumentation;
  - etc
- ↳ **Note:** this is not a design, it is a problem decomposition
  - actual design might have any number of components, with no relation to these sub-problems
- ↳ **However,** the choice of problem decomposition will probably be reflected in the design

© Easterbrook 2004 15

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Modelling Principle 2: Abstraction

→ **Abstraction**

- ↳ A way of finding similarities between concepts by ignoring some details
- ↳ Focuses on the general/specific relationship between phenomena
  - Classification groups entities with a similar role as members of a single class
  - Generalization expresses similarities between different classes in an 'is\_a' association

→ **Example:**

- ↳ requirement is to handle faults on the spacecraft
- ↳ might group different faults into fault classes

<p><b>based on location:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↳ instrumentation fault,</li> <li>↳ communication fault,</li> <li>↳ processor fault,</li> <li>↳ etc</li> </ul>	OR	<p><b>based on symptoms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↳ no response from device;</li> <li>↳ incorrect response;</li> <li>↳ self-test failure;</li> <li>↳ etc...</li> </ul>
--	----	--

© Easterbrook 2004 16

Source: Adapted from Davis, 1990, p48 and Loucopoulos & Karakostas, 1995, p78

University of Toronto Department of Computer Science

## Modelling Principle 3: Projection

→ **Projection:**

- ↳ separates aspects of the model into multiple viewpoints
  - similar to projections used by architects for buildings

→ **Example:**

- ↳ Need to model the requirements for a spacecraft
- ↳ Model separately:
  - safety
  - commandability
  - fault tolerance
  - timing and sequencing
  - Etc...

→ **Note:**

- ↳ Projection and Partitioning are similar:
  - Partitioning defines a 'part of' relationship
  - Projection defines a 'view of' relationship
- ↳ Partitioning assumes the parts are relatively independent

© Easterbrook 2004 17

Source: Adapted from Davis, 1990, p48-51

