SPECIFYING FEATURE-DEPENDENT MAINTAINABILITY REQUIREMENTS IN AN OPERATIONAL MANNER – CASE STUDY WITH PRACTITIONERS

Philipp Haindl and Reinhold Plösch

IWSM-MENSURA 2020,
OVERVIEW OF THE TALK

- Research Context and Motivation
- TAICOS Approach and Constraint DSL
- Case Study
  - Research Questions
  - Design and Participants’ Tasks
- Results
- Conclusion and Future Work
RESEARCH CONTEXT AND MOTIVATION

- Non-functional requirements differ among software features
- **Example**: Performance requirements on your running watch, maintainability requirements of critical vs seldomly used features
- Lack of operational definition and evaluation of these NFRs on feature level
- Practice: many projects use the most critical value of an NFR and demand fulfillment
  - \( \rightarrow \) increased engineering effort which doesn’t pay back and isn’t required

- **TAICOS approach for specifying, measuring, and evaluating feature-dependent NFRs in DevOps**
TAICOS APPROACH

- **Specifying**
  - Operational Constraints DSL
  - Formalize NFRs as constraints
- **Measuring**
  - Acquire measures through instruments
  - Software prototype
- **Evaluating**
  - Criteria to evaluate constraint fulfillment
  - Software prototype
TAICOS – CONSTRAINT LANGUAGE

Acquisition of Measures

- Acquire the measures from the different systems
- Types of acquired data
  - Measures (numerical)
  - Ratings (ordinal)
  - Rule (numerical)
  - Benchmark (ordinal)

Evaluation of Feature Constraints

- Evaluate constraint expressions
- Time series operations
  (avg, min, max, median, gradient)
- Comparison operators (<, <=, >, >=)
- Time filters (days, weeks, months)
- Threshold value (numeric, ordinal)
CASE STUDY
Case Study: Goal and Research Questions

- **Goal:** Determine if practitioners can apply the language for expressing maintainability requirements of their companies (→ Case Study with practitioners)

- **Research Questions:**
  - Are scope and expressiveness of the different language elements appropriate to specify feature-dependent NFRs?
  - Is the combination of the different language elements suitable to express maintainability requirements?
  - What are typical language patterns depending on the maintainability requirements in the companies?
  - What are benefits and weaknesses of the language?
CASE STUDY: DESIGN AND TASKS

- 14 domain experts, i.e., (senior) software engineers, DevOps engineers, and architects each with > 10 years of experience

- **Case study design**
  - *Introductory part:* Detailed explanation of the constraint language, Q&A with participant, explanation of purpose, sequence, and concrete tasks in the case study
  - *Practical part:* Participants choose 3 features and 5 maintainability requirements of their companies and apply the constraint language
  - *Interview part* (10 open, 13 closed questions):
    - Assessing scope, expressiveness, suitability of the language elements on a 4-point Likert scale
    - Missing operators and time filters
    - Problems and weaknesses, questions regarding visualization of constraint evaluation results
RESULTS

- **Quantitative analysis**
  - 222 constraint (basis to assess frequency of data types, time series operators, time filters)

- **Qualitative analysis**
  - Codified expressed maintainability requirement of the constraints
  - Condensed 43 categories (in total) into 9 main categories of maintainability requirements
  - 397 statements (28 on average per interview)
RESULTS – SCOPE OF LANGUAGE ELEMENTS

- In total, very positive feedback
- Two important observations: assessment of time series operations (overcharged, sufficient)
RESULTS – EXPRESSIVENESS OF LANGUAGE ELEMENTS

- Again, very positive feedback, no particular observations
RESULTS – SUITABILITY

- All ratings at least suitable
- Reasons for two participants rating as *rather not suitable*
  - Modularization of features in their prevents definition of meaningful constraints
  - Due to large number of features in their companies: essential for them to rather define general constraints for all features and only exceptions
RESULTS – USAGE PATTERNS PER MAINTAINABILITY ASPECT (DATA TYPES)

- **Total instances:** 49 measure, 20 rule, 6 rating
- **Measure** most heavily used among all types
RESULTS – USAGE PATTERNS PER MAINTAINABILITY ASPECT (OPERATIONS)

- **Total instances:** 5 min, 13 max, 11 avg, 2 median, 17 gradient, and 5 benchmark operations

- Gradient and benchmark operations not as frequently used as expected
RESULTS – USAGE PATTERNS PER MAINTAINABILITY ASPECT (TIME FILTERS)

Total instances: 7 days, 20 weeks, and 20 months

Time filter usage equally distributed
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

- In all aspects, majority rates completeness, scope, and expressiveness on high scores

- Limitations:
  - Notion of feature in companies and how to apply TAICOS notion of it
  - Large quantity of features
  - In same companies, industry sector, no time series are interesting: e.g., when no rule violations are allowed at all

- Future work
  - Methodological support (which metrics are when important)
  - Set operations, advanced comparison operations, advanced time filters (for sprints/iterations, or events)
  - Tool support, when faced with a large number of constraint specifications
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