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ABSTRACT
Separation of concerns is a basic engineering principle that is often applied in object-oriented analysis and design by dissociating functional aspects (business objects) from non-functional ones, such as persistency, fault-tolerance and so on. The Unified Modeling Language (UML) then gives the designer a rich, but somehow disorganized, set of views on her model as well as many features, such as design pattern occurrences, stereotypes or tag values to add non-functional annotations to a model. In this paper, we explore a possibility to organize all of these features around the central notions of (1) quality of service contracts (for specifying non-functional properties a la QML) and (2) aspects for describing how they can be implemented. We propose to model contracts in UML with a small set of stereotypes, and to represent aspects a bit like design pattern occurrences, that is using parameterized collaborations equipped with transformation rules expressed with meta-level OCL2. The design level aspect weaver presented in Section 3 is then just a meta-level OCL2 interpreter, that takes a UML model as entry point, processes the various aspect applications as specified by the designers, and outputs another (detailed design level) UML model that can serve as a basis for code generation.

1. INTRODUCTION
Separation of concerns [12] is a basic engineering principle that can provide many benefits: additive, rather than invasive, change; improved comprehension and reduction of complexity; adaptability, customizability, and reuse. With its nine views that can be thought of as projections of a whole multi-dimensional system onto separate plans, the Unified Modeling Language (UML) [22] provides the designer with an interesting separation of concerns that Kruchten calls the 4+1 view model (Design view, Component view, Process view, Deployment view, plus Use Case view) [15]. In turn, each of these views has two dimensions, one static and one dynamic. Furthermore the designer can add non-functional information (e.g. persistency requirements) to a model by “stamping” model elements, for instance with design pattern occurrences [8], stereotypes or tag values. In this paper, we explore a possibility to organize all of these features around the central notions of quality of service contracts (for specifying non-functional properties) and aspects for describing how they can be implemented. In Section 2, we propose to model contracts in UML with a small set of stereotypes, and to represent aspects a bit like design pattern occurrences, that is using parameterized collaborations equipped with transformation rules expressed with meta-level OCL2. The design level aspect weaver presented in Section 3 is then just a meta-level OCL2 interpreter, that takes a UML model as entry point, processes the various aspect applications as specified by the designers, and outputs another (detailed design level) UML model that can serve as a basis for code generation. Section 4 gives an illustration of our approach on a toy example. We discuss related work in Section 5 and conclude on the interest and perspectives of our approach.

2. DESIGNING WITH ASPECTS AND UML
The aim of this section is to extend the ideas expressed in aspect-oriented programming (AOP) [14] to the software modeling level. In [2], the authors explicit the gap that exists between requirements and design on the one hand, and between design and code on the other hand. AOP should then be extended to the modeling level where aspects could be explicitly specified during the design process. Indeed, we believe that with the support of an open transformation framework, it is possible to weave these aspects into a final implementation model.

We use UML as our design language because it is an open standard [22], as well as general purpose object-oriented modeling language. UML supports the concept of multiple views that allow a software designer to express various requirements, design and implementation decisions using each view independently. The design is founded on the meta-model of UML, ensuring the coherence of the various views. The extension features of UML also allow it to be customized for a specific modeling environment.

2.1 Expressing Aspects with UML
The various modeling dimensions of UML can already provide a good separation of concerns when modeling software. But in order to specify additional non-functional information or cross-cutting behavior (e.g. persistency), we need to resort to UML built-in extension mechanisms. Using these, the designer can add a great deal of non-functional information to a model by “hooking”
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annotations to model elements. We propose to organize all of these features around the central notions of (1) quality of service contracts (for specifying non-functional properties a la QML [32]) and (2) aspects for describing how they can be implemented.

2.2 Modeling Contracts in UML

With the word contract we mean the specification of constraints that have to be met when some entity requests a service from another entity. Document[31] defines four different levels of contracts. The first level deals with parameter type compatibility, the second level with pre and postconditions, the third with synchronization constraints and the fourth with non-functional features such as request completion time, throughput and so on. In this paper we briefly recall our contract metamodel for this fourth level.

Our model is based on the QML concepts for expressing non-functional values, adapted to fit component-based designs. From the point of view of an application designer, contract types are entities used in class diagram to state non-functional constraints. A contract type is an instance for the Contract meta entity that we added to the UML metamodel. This Contract entity is a specialization of the Interface standard entity of the metamodel. A contract type contains dimensions. Each dimension can be seen as an axis of some quality measure. Hence a contract type defines a quality space. At run time contract instances describe a point in that quality space or a subspace defined with comparison operators.

Our fourth level contract also takes contract dependencies into account. In real life, service providers (components, objects, methods) declare that they will comply with a given contract type if and only if their environment does comply with a set of contract types. For instance, a bound on a request execution time is valid if and only if the maximum network delay is less than 100 milliseconds. So with respect to a contract aware piece of software, we distinguish between provided contracts and required contracts (this notion is similar to the distinction between pre and post conditions). We use the UML dependency association to express this provided/required relationship in UML models.

2.3 Realizing Contracts with Aspects

An aspect can be used to show how a contract is implemented. Typically the pieces of the design that realize a certain contract are scattered across the entire design. That is the reason why AOP is an appropriate solution for separating the implementation of a contract from the rest of the model. At some point in time we have to weave the aspect with the target UML model to produce the final implementation model. Therefore, the aspect weaver has to know where exactly the aspect touches the target model. That brings us to one of the important AOP topics, the question of how to define join-points.

Before we talk about the how it has to be resolved where join-points are defined. In typical AOP extensions of programming languages the join-points are usually part of the aspect. That means the aspect weaver needs to know about the target and the aspect and then it can start weaving. In our approach that is a bit different, since this approach couples the aspect tightly with the target model. There are little chances to reuse the same aspect for another target model. We decided to remove this shortcoming. Therefore, the definition of join-points is no longer an integral part of the aspect itself. Instead they form a third entity that connects the target model with the aspect. To some degree that blurs the borders between aspects and parametric collaborations.

Since aspects do not have hard coded join-points anymore we have to pass them as arguments to formal parameters of the aspect. In AspectJ join-points are related to constructs of the target language such as functions, classes, etc. Since our aspects live in the context of the UML our join-points are elements of the UML meta-model. Each instance of a meta-class may be passed as an argument to the formal parameter of an aspect. These formal parameters have a type: a meta-class of the UML meta-model. Thus, the formal parameters of an aspect are conceptually very close to the signature of functions in procedural languages like C. The type of the parameters can be automatically derived since each parameter has a corresponding element inside the aspect’s definition. Otherwise the type has to be stated explicitly in the aspect’s signature.

In order to provide support for more complicated aspects a simple list of formal parameters is not sufficient. Imagine that the formal parameters of an aspect are a class and a method. To make it more complicated we want to pass one class and multiple of its methods as join-points (respectively: arguments) to the aspect. That is impossible with a flat list of formal parameters. We allow for the definition of ln relationships between parameters. In figure 2 this is illustrated by the curly braces around the second formal parameter. The second parameter is in fact a set.

It is important to notice that an aspect has now a well defined interface that explains how it can be woven with the target model. In order of using an aspect that is all a designer needs to know. On the other hand, the implementation is entirely encapsulated inside the aspect. That in turn means that it is possible to reuse an aspect with other – comparable – target models.

In the next chapter we discuss how we can actually define an aspect, because until now we did more or less only declare an aspect and showed how to bind it to the target model. The modeling elements inside the aspect can be thought of as a meta-program that is interpreted by the aspect weaver.

3. WEAVING UML DESIGNS

Kase is a tool for drawing UML models. Unlike other tools it does not enforce the concept of certain diagram types. Everything that is allowed by the meta-model can be drawn. This is especially important for modeling aspects since they do not fit in any existing diagram category. Additionally, Kase can import UML profiles and provide enhanced notation for the stereotyped UML elements. Thus, we can provide a new notation for aspects while we still rely solely on standard UML extension mechanisms.

UMLAUT is a framework dedicated to the manipulation of UML models. Since UML is itself described by a meta-model in UML, manipulating the meta-model is the same as manipulating any model. Hence we deal with the weaving of AOD designs by handling the model at the meta-model level. To this aim we are developing a meta-level OCL2 interpreter (connected to Kase) where to execute the weaving operations as specified in each relevant aspect applied onto the initial model.
We advocate that the UML has indeed enough expressive power to fulfil all our needs. In particular, the Object Constraint Language (OCL) [27] which is a standardized part of the UML is the language of choice for expressing the selection criterion of a transformation, as it was specifically designed to provide powerful constructs (such as select, forAll and other iterate operators) dedicated to collection processing.

Writing transformations mostly consists in navigating through instances of Uml. meta-elements. For example, retrieving applications of the Command pattern (which are Collaborations) in a Package may be realized with the following filtering operation declaration:

```
context Package::commands()
operation declaration:
in a
based on the OCL2 proposal which is currently being standardized
describe actions with the help of the newest version of the OCL,
operations are not side-effect free and cannot be expressed with
However, most transformation operations on UML involves
evaluation of these operations on a model.
An OCL interpreter integrated in UMLAUT performs the
post : result = commands()->ownedElement ->select(name =
Command
Then finding Classifiers playing the role of a receiver in the
Command pattern is done with the following receivers() operation,
navigating through the UML metamodel, from Collaboration to
ClassifierRole, then via ClassifierRole to Classifier:

```
context Package::receivers()
operation declaration:
in a
Later in the UML metamodel:

```
post : result = command() ->ownedElement ->select(name =
"receiver") ->base

```

An OCL interpreter integrated in UMLAUT performs the
evaluation of these operations on a model.

However, most transformation operations on UML involves
addition, modification or removal of model elements. These
operations are not side-effect free and cannot be expressed with
the OCL version 1.0. To deal with this situation, we propose to
describe actions with the help of the newest version of the OCL,
based on the OCL2 proposal which is currently being standardized
at the OMG. This introduces in the UML metamodel classes such as
CreateAction, DeleteAction, CreateLinkAction,
DeleteLinkAction, or AssignmentAction that can be used as
primitive operations for model transformations.

The weaving process is thus implemented as a model
transformation process: each weaving step is a transformation step
applied to a Uml model. Hence the final output is a Uml model,
too. Using the UML meta-modelling architecture and OCL2 for
specifying transformations is appealing: the development of metas
and their documentation is capitalizing on experience designers have gained when
modeling UML applications. Some recurrent problems then
disappear: portability of transformations is ensured for all UML
compliant tools with access to the meta-model, there is no
learning-curve for the writing of new meta-tools, as it is pure
UML and any development process supporting the UML applies
to the building and reuse of transformations. This paves the way
towards off-the-shelf transformation components.

Using OCL2 as a transformation language is a very powerful
choice. However, many developers know how to use most of the
UML concepts, but they do not know about the UML meta-model.
This knowledge is crucial to write correct OCL expressions. Thus,
it would be helpful to provide a notation for the transformation that
is close to the standard UML notation and does not require
knowledge of the meta-model. We do not intend to provide just a
graphical notation for OCL expressions like in [27]. That is just
tweaking the notation without simplifying anything. Aspects for
programming languages such as AspectJ consist to a large degree
of normal program code enriched with some AOP-specific bells
and whistles. We propose to follow the same path when modelling
design aspects. If for example an aspect consists of two methods
that have to be woven with some class, then it seems straight
forward to show these two methods in standard UML style inside
the aspect’s notation. We base our ideas on work that has already
been done in the field of modelling collaborations and model
composition [29]. In the next chapter we provide a small example
that illustrates how this notation of an aspect can look like.

In our approach we combine the benefits of both approaches.
Using OCL2 we have full control of the model transformation and
we do not need any proprietary aspect weavers since the weaving
can be done with an standard OCL2 interpreter. On the other hand
we have a smarter notation that makes aspects easy to design and
to understand. The trick is to compile the information given by the
graphical notation into OCL2 expressions. The graphical notation
is used during the design of the aspect’s implementation but it is
not directly executed. We execute the OCL expressions instead.
Additionally, these OCL expressions can be used to exchange
aspects between developers and different UML tools since they
rely solely on standard (or soon to be standardized) UML
technology.

For the Kase tool AOP is just an additional UML profile together
with a module that provides the new notation. So internally the
model consists of standard UML with some stereotypes and
tagged values hidden behind the new notation. The OCL2
counterpart is executed by the UMLAUT framework. Since Kase
uses internally an observer pattern the user can follow the changes
of the model step by step. In contrast passing the aspects and
target model as XMI to some command line tool and reading in
the resulting XMI document is less comfortable, since the resulting
XMI document won’t include any layout information.
Furthermore, debugging an aspect is much easier if you can follow
the weaving process step by step on the screen.

4. EXAMPLE
In this Section we want to illustrate our ideas with an example.
Figure 1 shows one component. It realizes two interfaces. In
addition a non-functional contract is associated with the
component. Contracts are depicted like a convoluted sheet. The
compartment below the name is used for QoS-dimensions. In our
example a performance contract defines the maximum response
time for a function call in seconds. The little arrow in front of the
dimension indicates that a smaller value is better than a larger one.

```
context Package::commands()
operation declaration:
in a
based on the OCL2 proposal which is currently being standardized
describe actions with the help of the newest version of the OCL,
operations are not side-effect free and cannot be expressed with
However, most transformation operations on UML involves
evaluation of these operations on a model.
An OCL interpreter integrated in UMLAUT performs the
evaluation of these operations on a model.

However, most transformation operations on UML involves
addition, modification or removal of model elements. These
operations are not side-effect free and cannot be expressed with
the OCL version 1.0. To deal with this situation, we propose to
describe actions with the help of the newest version of the OCL,
based on the OCL2 proposal which is currently being standardized
at the OMG. This introduces in the UML metamodel classes such as
CreateAction, DeleteAction, CreateLinkAction,
DeleteLinkAction, or AssignmentAction that can be used as
primitive operations for model transformations.

The weaving process is thus implemented as a model
transformation process: each weaving step is a transformation step
applied to a Uml model. Hence the final output is a Uml model,
too. Using the UML meta-modelling architecture and OCL2 for
specifying transformations is appealing: the development of meta-
tools capitalizes on experience designers have gained when
modeling UML applications. Some recurrent problems then
disappear: portability of transformations is ensured for all UML-
compliant tools with access to the meta-model, there is no
learning-curve for the writing of new meta-tools, as it is pure
UML and any development process supporting the UML applies
to the building and reuse of transformations. This paves the way
towards off-the-shelf transformation components.

Using OCL2 as a transformation language is a very powerful
choice. However, many developers know how to use most of the
UML concepts, but they do not know about the UML meta-model.
This knowledge is crucial to write correct OCL expressions. Thus,
it would be helpful to provide a notation for the transformation that
is close to the standard UML notation and does not require
knowledge of the meta-model. We do not intend to provide just a
graphical notation for OCL expressions like in [27]. That is just
tweaking the notation without simplifying anything. Aspects for
programming languages such as AspectJ consist to a large degree
of normal program code enriched with some AOP-specific bells
and whistles. We propose to follow the same path when modelling
design aspects. If for example an aspect consists of two methods
that have to be woven with some class, then it seems straight
forward to show these two methods in standard UML style inside
the aspect’s notation. We base our ideas on work that has already
been done in the field of modelling collaborations and model
composition [29]. In the next chapter we provide a small example
that illustrates how this notation of an aspect can look like.

In our approach we combine the benefits of both approaches.
Using OCL2 we have full control of the model transformation and
we do not need any proprietary aspect weavers since the weaving
can be done with an standard OCL2 interpreter. On the other hand
we have a smarter notation that makes aspects easy to design and
to understand. The trick is to compile the information given by the
graphical notation into OCL2 expressions. The graphical notation
is used during the design of the aspect’s implementation but it is
not directly executed. We execute the OCL expressions instead.
Additionally, these OCL expressions can be used to exchange
aspects between developers and different UML tools since they
rely solely on standard (or soon to be standardized) UML
technology.

For the Kase tool AOP is just an additional UML profile together
with a module that provides the new notation. So internally the
model consists of standard UML with some stereotypes and
tagged values hidden behind the new notation. The OCL2
counterpart is executed by the UMLAUT framework. Since Kase
uses internally an observer pattern the user can follow the changes
of the model step by step. In contrast passing the aspects and
target model as XMI to some command line tool and reading in
the resulting XMI document is less comfortable, since the resulting
XMI document won’t include any layout information.
Furthermore, debugging an aspect is much easier if you can follow
the weaving process step by step on the screen.

4. EXAMPLE
In this Section we want to illustrate our ideas with an example.
Figure 1 shows one component. It realizes two interfaces. In
addition a non-functional contract is associated with the
component. Contracts are depicted like a convoluted sheet. The
compartment below the name is used for QoS-dimensions. In our
example a performance contract defines the maximum response
time for a function call in seconds. The little arrow in front of the
dimension indicates that a smaller value is better than a larger one.
The diagram shown in figure 1 is completely declarative. It does not show how the non-functional contract is implemented. Our intention is to separate the non-functional aspect from the remaining design using aspects. Figure 2 shows how that can look like.

The package called Component contains the implementation of the interfaces and one helper class. To achieve a certain performance our aspect introduces the concept of load balancing. The load class that implements the load balancing has to offer the same interfaces as the component. Furthermore it uses the original implementation as a kind of replica. That means the aspect weaver will perform basically three actions:

1. Insert the new class called LoadBalancer.
2. Create a generalization between each supported interface and the load balancer class.
3. Create an association between the load balancer and the original implementation class.

The aspect is now transformed into a set of OCL2 expressions, which are then executed. The result is shown in figure 3. The LoadBalancer derives from both interfaces and is connected via an association with the ImplementCalc class.

In this example we have shown how aspects can be used in class diagrams. The same principles can be applied to all other kind of UML diagrams such as state charts and activity diagrams. For example we can pass two states to the formal parameters of another aspect. This aspect can then add new states and transitions to a state chart. This way aspects can be used to model behaviour, too.

5. RELATED WORK
5.1 Aspect and Subject-Oriented Programming

Adaptive programming [21], aspect-oriented programming [14], and subject-oriented programming [10] have taken software development beyond the class concept of object-oriented programming. They address explicitly additional dimensions that constitute the inherent complexity of software. We believe that these works at the implementation level can be broaden to the entire software cycle and lead to aspect-oriented design (AOD). The use of UML in the context of AO modeling is already evident in [13], [2], [3], [26] and [3] has proposed to explicit multi-dimensional concerns for the entire software development cycle.

Our work aims at providing an automated tool to support the expression of aspects at the design model level. The provision of meta-level interpreter has the added advantage that the user can define weaving strategies by composing the transformation operations. Using transformations during the weaving process is demonstrated by [19] and [7]. Relative to their source code
oriented approach, UMLAUT addresses transformation with a design oriented, meta-modelling approach.

In short, we use UMLAUT to apply aspect-oriented concepts for the entire software development cycle. We express weaving of software aspects in terms of model transformations. Its implementation as a meta-level OCL2 interpreter makes it open for extension and customization.

5.2 UML Model Transformation

Using a functional programming paradigm in an object-oriented context has been proven to be a versatile technique (see [4], [18], [16]), especially when flexible composition and list-like processing are involved. The UMLAUT transformation framework has taken this idea to provide an extensible AOD environment. The main interest of this extensibility is the possibility of defining the weaving strategy by recomposition of primitive transformation operators. The transformation of software models is widely applied in tool automation for design patterns, software refactoring [23][24], equivalence transformations [9], [1], [25], and formal reasoning [17]. UMLAUT's transformation incorporates ideas from these works, and extends them to automate the definition of weaving operations in the context of AOD. In addition, UMLAUT exposes the concept of explicit model transformation to a software designer so that she can benefit from the versatility of this open approach.

6. CONCLUSION

We have proposed to organize non-functional and cross-cutting behavior in UML model around the central notions of quality of service contracts (for specifying non-functional properties) and aspects for describing how they can be implemented. Based on QML concepts, we propose to model contracts in UML with a small set of stereotypes, and to represent using parameterized collaborations equipped with transformation rules expressed with meta-level OCL2. The design level aspect weaver presented is then just a meta-level OCL2 interpreter.

With this possibility of modeling aspects and contracts in UML, we believe that aspect-oriented programming core ideas could be extended to the entire software development cycle. Each aspect of design and implementation should be declared as a contract linked to the business model, and expanded during the design phase so that there is clear traceability from requirements through source code.

We are currently developing a proof of concept tool, connecting the UMLAUT tool from INRIA and the Kase tool from TU-Berlin in the framework of the IST Quality Controlled Component based Software engineering (see http://www.qccs.org).
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