MDA Distilled

Stephen J. Mellor Vice-President Project Technology, Inc. http://www.projtech.com

PROJECT TECHNOLOGYINC.

Table of contents

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

What's the problem?

Software is expensive, and productivity is low for many reasons. Amongst them:

- Code is at too low level of abstraction
- Reuse occurs (to the extent it does at all) at too low a granularity
- Any code is glued together (at great expense) to its infrastructure (also expressed as code)
- Mapping information (design expertise) is applied—then lost



Expensive and hard-to-find!

Language abstraction

High-level language source code is two-dimensional.



Reuse granularity

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Components and frameworks require common infrastructure.



1970's 1980's 1990's 2000's

Code binds

Code is glued to its infrastructure:

- Binds device control to the database
- Binds the copier to (device control and the database)
- Binds the image to the (copier and (device control and the database))...



Mapping information is lost

- Mapping between layers is all skilled manual labor.
- And once a mappings is 'found,' it is applied by hand
- When a change is made, the mappings are not repeatable.



Components of an MDA solution

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Capture *each layer* in a platform-independent manner as intellectual property.

Capture *the mappings* to the implementation as intellectual property (IP).

Layer by layer.

Models and mappings become assets.

Enter Model-Driven Architecture

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



MDA: an interoperability standard for combining models at design-time.

This enables a market for IP in software.

Enter Model-Driven Architecture

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Table of contents



- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

Modeling language for software

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

"The <u>Unified Modeling Language</u> is a language for specifying, constructing, visualizing, and documenting the artifacts of a software-intensive system."



Abstraction and classification



Why model?

A good model:

- Abstracts away not-currentlyrelevant stuff
- Accurately reflects the relevant stuff, so it...
- Helps us reason about our problem
- Is cheaper to build than code
- Communicates with people
- Communicates with machines



What is a model?

A model is coherent set of elements that:

- Covers some subject matters
 - Doesn't have to cover all subject matters
 - At some level of abstraction
 - Doesn't have to define realizations
- That need not expose everything
 - Doesn't have to show everything at once
- That need not be complete in itself

Doesn't have to include "code"



Seating plan? Materials? Interior? No engine yet!



Subject matters

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Good models come from separating layers by subject matter, so that each one is *platform independent.*

A change to models in one subject matter should not necessitate reconstruction of models in another subject matter.



Command Bitmap

Language Abstraction

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Model Views

A diagram is a coherent view on a model.



Model



Incompleteness

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Code can be added to a model later.

Executable UML models

UML can be used as a semantic modeling language, if we:

- Define actions
- Define the context
- Define execution rules

for an underlying semantic model.

The underlying semantic model is an: <u>executable</u> <u>translatable</u> UML.



Defining behavior using UML



UML can now be used to define behavior

 UML 1.5/2.0 now has Action Semantics

- Use an executable translatable profile of UML (^X_TUML)
- X_TUML defines
 behavior without
 making premature
 design decisions

Three primary diagrams



Table of contents

- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models



- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

What is a metamodel?

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

A metamodel captures developer models in a model repository.

What is the structure of the repository?



UML metamodel



Instance-of



The relationship to the metamodel



Metamodel instances





Four-layer architecture

The "four-layer architecture" is a simple way to refer to each layer.

(In reality, meta-levels are relative.)



Fourth Layer

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

The fourth layer is a *model of the metamodel*, which yields a "meta-meta-model." It is the simplest model that can model the metamodel.

A metamodel of the "meta-meta-model" (i.e. the "meta-meta-meta-model") would have the same structure as the meta-meta-model. This layer is:

Reflective

Normally associated with the MOF



MOF

The Meta-Object Facility is an OMG standard that defines the structures for M3.

Any metamodel can be captured in MOF (not just UML), which makes it the basis

for defining standards that ...

...map between metamodels.

Table of contents

- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels



- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

Mapping functions

A mapping function transforms one model into another.



Types of mappings

In general, a mapping can be:



Example of merging mapping



Metamodel-metamodel mappings

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Why MOF?

A metamodel (as stored in MOF) allows us to state mapping rules.

- For each Class....
- For each Structural Feature...
- For each Attribute...
- For each Action

rather than manipulate specific classes in the developer model.

This means a standard "mapping tool" can be defined: QVT.

Metamodel-metamodel mappings

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

.function Transform .param inst_ref class .open OOA, Arch; .select many PDMs related by class->attribute[R105] in OOA .for each PDM in PDMs Insert PDM in PDMTable in Arch; .endfor .end function QVT is a standard approach for defining *mapping functions* that map between metamodels

Inserts element ("attribute") in target metamodel.

- Query
- View
- Transform

QVT

There is presently no standard, but three approaches present themselves:

- Imperative,
- Template,
- Declarative.

The RFP explicitly demands declarative, but alternatives have been proposed.

Table of contents

- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings



- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

Why marks?

A *mark* distinguishes multiple possible targets.



Kinds of marks

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Inputs

(Append "db " to all database operation names)

Other marks

Marking models

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

- A *marking model* is a way to declare:
 - Names of marks
 - Where they belong in the metamodel
 - Their types.

```
Invocation: Accessibility ::=
  [ isRemote | is Boolean ] = isRemote
```

```
ClassExtent: StorageType ::=
(if numInstances < Q && frequencyOfAccess < F
? LinkedList
| HashTable ) : int
```

Table of contents

- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks



- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

Profiles

A *profile* is a UML mechanism used to define and extend metamodels.

- Profiles may be used to define metamodels for PIMs and PSMs
- Profiles may be used to define marking models
- A profile is defined in terms of:
 - Stereotypes that extend "meta-"classes, and
 - *Constraints*, defined using OCL

Example

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Figure 12-99: A simple EJB profile Superstructure submission

Table of contents

- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models



- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion

Elaborative development





Intermixed Application and Design

Manually Created Code Bodies and Implementation Details Required for Model Execution and Code Generation

Target Code assembled from Hand-Coded Bodies inserted into a generated framework

What's wrong with that?



What's the solution?

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Model each domain using a:

- single neutral formalism that
- (perforce) conforms to the same metamodel



A design-time interoperability bus

What's the solution?

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Connect up the models according to:

- a single set of mapping rules that
- operate on to the same metamodel



Metamodel-to-text mappings

MDA needs a way to map data from a metamodel into text.

.function ClassDef .param inst_ref class class \${class.name} : public ActiveInstance { private: .invoke PrivateDataMember(class) }end function

.function PrivateDataMember .param inst_ref class .select many PDMs related by class->attribute[R105] .for each PDM in PDMs \${PDM.Type} \${PDM.Name}; .endfor .end function

We call them "archetypes".

Example

The archetype language produces text.

```
.select many stateS related to instances of
     class->[R13]StateChart ->[R14]State
        where (selected.isFinal == FALSE)
public:
                                          public:
 enum states e
                                           enum states e
  \{ NO STATE = 0, \}
                                            \{ NO STATE = 0, \}
for each state in stateS
                                               Filling,
                                               Cooking,
     .if (not last stateS)
                                               NUM_STATES = Emptying
        ${state.Name },
                                            }:
     else
        NUM_STATES = ${state.Name}
     endif
endfor
ł;
```

Agile MDA

- Each model we build covers a single subject matter.
- We uses the same *executable* modeling language for all subject matters.
- The executable model does not imply an implementation.
- Compose the models automatically.
- This last is *design-time composability—a bus.*



Model compilers

A model compiler compiles each model according to a single set of architectural rules so that the various subject matters *are known to fit together*.



A design-time interoperabili ty bus

A model compiler

- Normalizes models to the infrastructure
 - Combines models at design time.

Model compilers

System dimensions include:

- Concurrency and sequentialization
- Multi-processing & multi-tasking
- Persistence
- Data structure choices
- Data organization choices





Examples

Financial system

- Highly distributed
- Concurrent
- Transaction-safe with rollback
- Persistence, with rollback
- C++

Telecommunication system

- Highly distributed
- Asynchronous
- Limited persistence capability

C++

Embedded system

Single task

(

- No operating system
- Optimized data access and storage

Simulation system

- Mostly synchronous
- Few tasks
- Special-purpose language: "Import"

All domains are translated

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Building the system

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Generate deliverable production code.



Retargeting the environment

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.



Realized in thin systems









MDA models can have multiple implementations depending on the target environment.

Table of contents

- 1. What's the problem?
- 2. Models
- 3. Metamodels
- 4. Mappings
- 5. Marks
- 6. Representing models
- 7. Agile MDA
- 8. Conclusion



Building a market

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Design time composability:

- protects IP
- allows IP to be mapped to multiple implementations
- enables a market in IP in software







MDA enables a market for IP in software!

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

Code-driven development produces expenses.



Model-driven development produces assets.

OMG TLAs



MDA standardization

UML 2.0 Infrastructure QVT (metamodel-metamodel) Marks Action Language Archetypes (metamodel-text) Jan 2003 Mar 2003 Understood Necessary? Not yet

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY. INC.

The ADTF and the MDA WG proposes these RFPs.

See also

MDA Distilled, Mellor, Scott, Uhl and Weise Addison-Wesley, 2003

Executable UML, Mellor and Balcer, Addison-Wesley, 2003

<u>www.omg.org</u> <u>www.projtech.com</u>

MDA Distilled

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

MDA Distilled

- Started in earnest in March 2002
- First four chapters sent for review in July 2002
- Chapters 5-9 sent for review February 2003
- Meeting to complete last five chapters June 2003
- Review complete by July 2003
- "I have scheduled your book to go into production on 8/1/03."
 - (i.e. 2003-08-01)



PROJECT TECHNOLOGY, INC.

PROJECT TECHNOLOGY

Accelerating development of highquality systems.

Makers of BridgePoint[®] Modeling Tools

Stephen J. Mellor Project Technology, Inc. http://www.projtech.com