



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Finkelstein, A., Nuseibeh, B., Finkelstein, L. & Huang, J. (1992). Technology Transfer: software engineering and engineering design. IEE Computing and Control Engineering Journal, 3(6), pp. 259-264. doi: 10.1049/cce:19920073

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/26498/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1049/cce:19920073>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Technology Transfer: Software Engineering and Engineering Design

A. Finkelstein, B. Nuseibeh

Department of Computing
Imperial College of Science, Technology & Medicine
180 Queen's Gate
London, SW7 2BZ
Email: {acwf, ban}@doc.ic.ac.uk

L. Finkelstein, J. Huang

Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering
The City University
London, EC1V 0HB

ABSTRACT

Software engineering has made significant contributions to “engineering-in-the-large”. The nature of the software process has been researched, and computer based tools and environments have been built to support this process. Other more established engineering disciplines, such as instrument design, have developed professional practices, mature mathematical frameworks for system modelling and accepted quality standards lacking in software engineering. Little effort however, has been devoted to the cross-fertilisation of software engineering and engineering design, or indeed the exploitation of the frequently observed commonalities between them. The Software Engineering and Engineering Design (SEED) project described in this article has attempted to address these issues through the study of heterogeneous, composite systems. This has resulted in a model of the engineering design process, an organisational framework for systems development methodology and integrated computer-based support for this framework.

INTRODUCTION

Many large and complex systems deploy a variety of different technologies, and require a variety of development strategies and notations to specify their behaviour. Modern instruments for example, have substantial software components alongside their electronic and mechanical hardware. Such systems require the coexistence, even the incorporation of, software engineering methods within the traditional engineering design process.

There are clear similarities between the disciplines of software engineering and instrument design, yet enough differences to tempt the transfer of successful development techniques from either discipline to the other. The SEED project [Fink90] has systematically studied these similarities and differences in its attempt to transfer technology and expertise from one discipline to the other. Concurrently, an organisational framework for systems development methodologies has been constructed to describe, manage and apply the engineering design process to the development of heterogeneous, composite systems [Fink92].

SEED is a collaborative project between Imperial College and City University, and builds on the substantial experience of the partners in supporting software development and instrument design.

Software Engineering. While computer scientists devise improved techniques for structuring and programming large, complex systems, software engineering research focuses on the controlled management of such techniques within the context of the software development “life cycle”. As software systems have grown in size and complexity, software engineering as a discipline has focused on the *process* of software development.

Software development projects encompass a range of activities that precede, include and follow programming. Foremost among these activities is the elicitation, specification and analysis of system requirements. Requirements specification is now recognised as the essential first step in any systems development process, and its documentation is often the contractual reference against which system designs are validated.

Software engineering research has produced a multitude of specification and design *methods* that may be used to describe system requirements and design architectures. These methods typically utilise a number of different representation styles or notations together with prescriptions of how to go about producing specifications using these notations. Many general problems such as incompleteness, inconsistency and ambiguity in specification have been encountered, and powerful approaches developed to try and resolve them. Computer aided software engineering (CASE) tools and integrated programming support environments (IPSEs) have emerged to provide practical, automated support for these methods. Such computer- based tools provide a means for enacting methods’ underlying process models using the notations prescribed by these methods. Considerable experience has now been gained within the software engineering community in both CASE tool technology and the underlying development methods which CASE tools support.

Instrument Design. Instruments are an interesting class of engineering artifacts. They are composite systems, consisting of a large number of interacting sub-components and employing a variety of different technologies (mechanical, electrical, information processing, even biological and chemical). They are a class of artifacts whose general properties are well known and in the design of which there is considerable expertise. Instrument systems are therefore an excellent vehicle for exploring heterogeneous systems development and inter-disciplinary technology transfer.

Technology Transfer. Technology transfer deals with the problems of fitting technology into a new setting. While this transfer is commonly perceived as flowing from research into industry, the SEED project has concentrated on the inter-disciplinary transfer of technology between software engineering and engineering design. The aim of the project has therefore

been to apply the techniques, methods and tools deployed by one discipline to solve problems of another. For example, the successful specification and consequent development of a digital storage oscilloscope using a software specification method, would be an instance of successful technology transfer from software engineering to engineering design.

An immediately noticeable barrier to such transfer is terminology. Software engineering and engineering design use a myriad of overlapping and inconsistent terms which must be disentangled before any transfer takes place. For example, the term “design” itself means different things to software and hardware engineers. A *requirements* specification created by an instrument engineer, may be treated by a software engineer as a *design* specification because of its “implementation bias”.

Once differences in vocabulary have been overcome, concrete differences in approach must be tackled. One such difference is evident in the role of explicit models of the development process. Process modelling is central to software development activities, and to varying extents always forms part of software development methods and their supporting tools. It does not play such an explicit role in engineering design. In fact, insofar as tools are concerned, automated support for engineering design is almost exclusively in the form of domain specific computer aided design (CAD) packages, and rarely includes aids for the elicitation, specification and analysis of requirements.

The converse of the above is also true. Engineering design invariably relies on elaborate value modelling and cost-benefit analysis to evaluate alternative designs. Software engineers on the other hand, are usually satisfied with a single solution that meets requirements, and have few metrics for evaluating designs or comparing alternatives.

Transferable Technologies. Process and value modelling are just two potentially transferable technologies addressed by the SEED project. Some others are shown in Figure-1. As with the preceding account these observations were made by focusing on commonalities between *requirements engineering* as a special branch of software engineering, and *instrument design* as a special branch of engineering design.

One particularly fruitful area of transfer has been in the area of structured and formal methods. For example, case studies [Fink91a] were conducted using the structured requirements specification method CORE [Mullery85] in which a variety of non-trivial instrument systems such as a cathode-ray oscilloscope were. In a second series of case studies [Fink91b], the formal method Z [Spivey89] was used to specify a variety of instrument system components such as a differential pressure sensor and part of a chemical process reactor. Both CORE and Z deploy a systematic process and use rich representations to produce descriptions of function and behaviour. This was reflected in the system specifications produced by the two methods. In both case studies, the use of software specification methods produced clear and concise specifications of the function and behaviour of the engineering artifacts. Moreover, in both cases, the successful application of these methods has also meant the successful utilisation of the CASE tools that support them.

Other areas of transfer continue to be investigated. In particular, the specification of so-called “non-functional requirements” that deal with aspects of systems that are difficult to quantify (such as reliability, colours, robustness, and so on), remains problematic. In general, engineering design has had more success in expressing these requirements and imposing strict quality assurance standards lacking in software engineering. The authors’

approach has been to attempt to quantify and formalise non-functional requirements, so that they may be expressed and analysed as functional ones. This is in line with current trends in software engineering where, for example, researchers in Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) have sought to formalise definitions of user interface properties to provide a consistent “look” and “feel” to interfaces. WIMPs (Windows, Icons, Mice, Pop-up menus) environments demonstrate such standardisation of interfaces.




Figure-1: Some areas of technology transfer between software engineering and engineering design. Arrows show the direction of transfer.

THE ENGINEERING DESIGN PROCESS

The formulation of a satisfactory model of the design process is a fundamental concern of many disciplines. It is treated, in particular, in the literature of engineering design, systems science, planning, creativity and in recent times in the literature of software and knowledge engineering. The motivation for the concern with the topic is the provision of a conceptual framework for the organisation of design activity, the support of the creative work of designers, the effective teaching of design and, finally, the automation of (or automated support for) design.

There exists an extensive literature of the topic. The authors have, among others, reviewed the literature of the classical views of design methodology and presented the generally accepted model of the design process [Fink83]. More recently Burton [Burton90] has reviewed the literature comprehensively and analysed critically the evidence in support of the generally accepted, or consensus, model.

As part of the SEED project, the deficiencies of the classical model have been examined, and a model more consistent with the developing perspectives of software and knowledge engineering presented.

Classical Consensus Model. While there are significant differences in the many presentations of models of the design process, they all fall within a common abstract model. The model is partly *descriptive*, an attempt to give an account how design is actually

carried out, and partly *prescriptive*, a recipe how design should be carried out. The model is based partly on theoretical analyses of the design process, based on an introspective rationalisation of the experience of a designer, and partly on empirical evidence. The latter is sometimes the result of systematic external observation of design activity and more often on participant observation, which is often indistinguishable from the theoretical, introspective rationalisation of the experienced designers. The essence of the consensus model, as it is seen by the authors, is as follows.

Design is considered as a complex information system, which transforms the statement of the perception of a want and the commitment to satisfy it, into a specification of a system or artifact to satisfy that want, such that the system or artifact can be made or implemented. The design process is built up of a sequence of elementary stages. The model of an elementary design stage is shown in Figure-2. Each stage is a sequence of processes: task definition, solution generation, solution analysis, solution evaluation and decision.

What is termed the task definition by the authors, is a process which transforms a model of the solution from the preceding stage of the design sequence into a requirement specification, including a value model for the solution of that stage.

The requirement specification is passed on to a solution generation process, which produces a model of a candidate solution, which may satisfy the requirement specification.

The solution generated is given in terms of its form. The process of analysis of the solution generates information about the function of the candidate solution.

The evaluation process receives information about the candidate solution form and function, and generates information about the value of the candidate solution in terms of the requirement specification value model.

The decision process receives the information about the value of the candidate solution and either accepts it as a specification of the solution to be used as the basis of the succeeding stage of design or else it either, returns to the generation of an alternative solution or, if the alternatives have been exhausted, it returns to modify the requirement specification. It may, if neither of the latter actions lead to an acceptable solution, return to the beginning of the preceding stage of the design process.

A total design process proceeds from an abstract and fuzzy model of the solution to a concrete and definite one. In engineering design the process typically has a planning stage which converts the statement of the perception of a want, and the commitment to satisfy it, to an abstract functional specification of the required solution. This followed by a conceptual design stage which specifies physical principles of the of the solution. The embodiment design process which succeeds conceptual design determines the geometrical form and materials of the solution. The final detailed design stages fixes the dimensions of the solution and any further necessary detail. An essential feature of most design process realisations, is the decomposition of the total system to be produced into component sub-systems, sub-sub-systems and so on down to elements. Component functional specifications, having been defined by a preceding stage, are then designed by parallel processes and integrated into the total system.




Figure-2: An elementary design stage in the classical consensus model of the engineering design process.

The model of the design process presented above is in accord with generally accepted accounts of the process, although the various models in the literature differ in detail in accordance with the perspective of the author, the domain of design considered, the size of system and the nature of the technologies involved. The differences involve in particular the subdivision of the steps of the elementary design process into a finer structure and different subdivision of the design process into stages.

The model presented above describes what is widely considered to be "good design practice". It is based on a design process that moves from the establishment of design requirements to the generation of a solution. It recognises that the sequence of requirement specification, candidate solution generation, analysis and evaluation is a logical necessity. It further recognises that design is necessarily a succession of stages, say, planning, conceptual design, embodiment design and detailed design, which must be carried out in an orderly

sequence. The decision of a preceding stage is a more or less rigid constraint on the following process, with a substantial resource penalty on a returning to a preceding stage.

The above merits of the model explain its general use. However it has a number of defects.

Deficiencies in Classical Model. The model only considers top-down design, starting from a requirement, formulating a solution in terms of high-level components which can satisfy those requirements and moving downwards. However, bottom-up design, in which design solutions for components of the design are starting points, may on occasion be appropriate, since top-down design may lead to difficult component problems. Further, effective reuse of preexisting designs seems to be difficult to accommodate in a top-down design approach. Middle-out design may also be appropriate. Neither bottom-up nor middle-out approaches fit well with the classical model.

The other, and in our opinion the most significant, defect of the model is that it stresses the sequential aspect of design. This fails to account for concurrent engineering - the speeding-up of the design process by carrying out a number of design stages in parallel by a single designer or by a design team.

The model does not explicitly recognise that a number of candidate concepts may be generated and developed in parallel at any stage. Indeed decision involves in general the choice among a set of candidates. Nor does the model explicitly show the important place of partial solutions arrived at during the process, the processing of which may which may be abandoned at some point, but returned to at a latter point.

Finally, the model does not explicitly show the place of knowledge in the design process, thereby rendering it largely unsuitable for assisting the developer; e.g., through automated design support.

In order to remedy these deficiencies, and to provide an improved basis for work on design automation, the authors propose an integrated object-based framework which resolves the deficiencies of the consensus model and supports the design and construction of heterogeneous, composite systems. The framework is formulated from a knowledge and software engineering perspective, and is described below.

AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK

So far, many of the *differences* in the development of software and hardware systems have been highlighted, and attempts have been made to transfer successful techniques across disciplines. Meanwhile, the underlying model of any engineering development process has been described, highlighting the *similarities* between engineering disciplines.

Nevertheless, while technology transfer and a unified design approach greatly enhance the process of systems development, the development of heterogeneous, composite systems invariably requires heterogeneous approaches to their design. The ViewPoint Oriented Systems Engineering (VOSE) framework [Fink92] is an organisational framework that acknowledges this requirement. The framework supports multiple notations and development strategies to describe multiple components of composite systems. ViewPoints represent “agents” having “roles-in” and “views-of” a problem domain. Each ViewPoint describes a partial specification of the problem domain, presented in a particular notation and developed using a particular strategy.

Motivation. Design of engineering systems is a complex activity. To support people engaged in it, “methods” which guide and organise the activity are required. Such methods consist of the following components: a set of representation schemes, that is, ways of describing the system under design; a model of the design process and a means for using that model to generate guidance on what to do in particular circumstances.

Such methods have a variety of uses: they can be used to guide individual designers; they can be used for management control; they can be used to set development standards and prescribe design deliverables; they can be used to give a development rationale; they can be used as a basis for principled tool support.

Experience in software engineering has shown that design methods are difficult to construct - for each area and aspect of system development a method must be “hand crafted”. There is a need for a framework which makes this process systematic.

If we examine how knowledge is applied in design we can distinguish three classes of knowledge: development knowledge, knowledge about the process of design; representation knowledge, knowledge about how the artifact or system is to be represented; design knowledge, knowledge about the artifact or system itself and the domain or context in which it is to be placed that arises out of the design process.

For the most part these three classes of knowledge have been treated separately: development knowledge through the study of models of the design process; representation knowledge, through the study of modelling techniques and specification languages; design knowledge through the study of design databases and CAD tools.

Our framework attempts to tie these classes of knowledge together to construct methods.

ViewPoints. A ViewPoint may be defined as a loosely coupled, locally managed, coarse-grained object, encapsulating the representation knowledge, development process knowledge and design (specification) knowledge of a particular problem domain. This knowledge is described in the five “slots” shown schematically in Figure-3.

The development participant associated with any particular ViewPoint is known as the ViewPoint “owner”. The owner is responsible for developing a ViewPoint *specification* using the notation defined by in the *style* slot, following the strategy defined by the *work plan*, for a particular problem *domain*. A development history is maintained in the *work record*.




Figure-3: A ViewPoint schematic. Style, work plan, domain, specification and work record are ViewPoint “slots” containing the representation, development and design (specification) knowledge described in the text.

Methods. Many ViewPoints may employ the same development technique (e.g., top-down functional decomposition) to produce different specifications for different domains. We therefore define a reusable *ViewPoint Template* in which only the style and work plan slots are elaborated. A single ViewPoint template may then be *instantiated* more than once to yield different ViewPoints.

In general, a method is composed of a number of different development techniques. Each technique has its own notation and rules about when and how to use that notation. Thus, in the context of the ViewPoints framework, a *method* is a configuration (structured collection) of ViewPoint templates, the templates corresponding to the method’s constituent development techniques.

Developments. A development is a configuration of ViewPoints instantiated from a method’s ViewPoint templates. These ViewPoints are related via inter-ViewPoint consistency rules, that may be enacted when full (or partial) consistency is required. Each ViewPoint is locally managed, responsible for its own in- and inter-ViewPoint consistency, and potentially distributable both logically and/or physically.

Consider for example the development of a computer-based instrument system such as a digital storage oscilloscope (DSO). It is a heterogeneous system composed of electronic and information processing components. We may choose to develop the specification of this oscilloscope using system block diagrams, functional decompositions, data flow diagrams and structured text. Our method in this context is a set of four ViewPoint templates, a template for each of the above four development techniques. Our DSO development project is a configuration of ViewPoints, instantiated from the templates provided. We may thus have a single ViewPoint whose specification contains the overall DSO system block diagram, a number of ViewPoints whose specifications contain functional decompositions of the various blocks of the DSO, a number of ViewPoints whose specifications contain data flow diagrams of the various components of the DSO, and several ViewPoints whose specifications contain structured text descriptions of various other ViewPoint specifications. The overall *system specification* for the DSO is then the configuration of all these ViewPoints, organised in a rectangular lattice, a hypertext network, a hierarchy, or any other suitably chosen organisational structure.

Integration. Integration is central to the ViewPoints framework. The framework may be used by method designers to integrate different development techniques, to build new methods, or simply to customise standard methods to their individual requirements. This is done by defining methods' constituent templates and the consistency relationships between them. Tool integration is treated as a special case of the more general method integration problem, and is thus a natural consequence of the method integration mechanisms of the framework. Individual tools may be constructed by tool developers to support individual templates, which are then integrated by the same inter-ViewPoint rules defined in the templates.

A development project in VOSE is a configuration of ViewPoints. These ViewPoints may be grouped together by common domain, template and/or arbitrary logical or managerial configurations. Whatever structuring mechanism is chosen, an appropriate management mechanism is needed to organise and navigate through large ViewPoint structures.

Tool Support. A prototype computer-based environment has been constructed to support the VOSE framework, and several sample tools supporting individual ViewPoint templates have been integrated into this environment [Nuseibeh92]. The environment, called *Theviewer*, was developed in Objectworks/Smalltalk and operates under X-windows, Macintosh OS or Windows for the PC. The object-based nature of the framework was particularly appropriate for an object-oriented implementation, which also facilitated the rapid prototyping of the environment.

Theviewer provides support for method designers and method users (Figure-4), and facilitates ViewPoint template description, ViewPoint development and ViewPoint management (Figure-5, 6, and 7 respectively).




Figure-4: The startup window of *The Viewer*. It defines the scope of the VOSE environment. The "Method Designer" button creates a Template Browser (Figure-5), while the "Method User" button creates a ViewPoint Configuration Browser (Figure-7).

CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK

This paper has described a variety of issues surrounding inter-disciplinary technology transfer tackled by the SEED project. At one level, the authors have examined the differences between the disciplines of software engineering and engineering design., and attempted to implant techniques from one into the other. At another level, the apparent similarities between the two engineering disciplines have been recognised and a unified model of the engineering design process has been constructed. This model fits into the proposed ViewPoint Oriented Systems Engineering (VOSE) framework, which acknowledges the similarities and differences between systems development disciplines, and attempts to provide both a framework and a mechanism for their integration. This has proved particularly relevant for the specification, design and construction of heterogeneous, composite systems. Such systems are often viewed from multiple perspectives, specified using a variety of development notations and strategies, and constructed using a number of different technologies.

The SEED project represents work still in progress. A computer based environment, *The Viewer*, supporting the VOSE framework has been constructed, and sample tools have been integrated into this environment. The intention is to upgrade *The Viewer* from prototype status into a fully operational environment supporting the distributed development of heterogeneous, composite systems. Further work is still needed however in the area of consistency checking between different representations, and the mechanisms for their enactment and implementation. Modelling the ViewPoint oriented development process is also being investigated, with the objective of providing automated, computer-based guidance for the ViewPoint developer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Jeff Kramer and Michael Goedicke for their contributions to the ViewPoints framework. Grateful acknowledgement is also made to the UK Science and Engineering Research Council (SERC) for its funding of the SEED project.

REFERENCES

- [Burton90] P.J. Burton, "A Model of the Design Process", Ph.D. thesis, The City University, London, 1990.
- [Fink83] L. Finkelstein and A. Finkelstein, "Review of Design Methodology", IEE Proceedings, Volume 130, Pt. A, Number 4, pp.213-222, June 1983.
- [Fink90] A. Finkelstein, T. Maibaum and L. Finkelstein, "Engineering-in-the-Large: Software Engineering and Instrumentation", Proceedings of UK IT 1990 Conference (IEE), Southampton, Conference Publication 316, pp.1-7, 19th-22nd March 1990.
- [Fink91a] L. Finkelstein, J. Huang, A. Finkelstein and B. Nuseibeh, "Using Software Specification Methods for Measurement Instrument Systems, Part 1: Structured Methods", Measurement Journal, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp.79-86, Apr-Jun 1992.
- [Fink91b] L. Finkelstein, J. Huang, A. Finkelstein, B. Nuseibeh, "Using Software Specification Methods for Measurement Instrument Systems, Part 2: Formal Methods", Measurement Journal, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp.87-92, Apr-Jun 1992.
- [Fink92] A. Finkelstein, J. Kramer, B. Nuseibeh, L. Finkelstein and M. Goedicke, "Viewpoints: A Framework for Integrating Multiple Perspectives in Systems Development", International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering, Special issue on "Trends and Future Research Directions in SEE", World Scientific Publishing Company Ltd., 1992.
- [Mullery85] G. Mullery, "Acquisition - Environment", (In) M. Paul & H. Siegert, Distributed Systems: Methods and Tools for Specification, LNCS 190, Springer-Verlag, 1985.
- [Nuseibeh92] B. Nuseibeh and A. Finkelstein, "ViewPoints: A Vehicle for Method and Tool Integration", Proceedings of International Workshop on Computer-Aided Software Engineering (CASE '92), Montreal, Canada, 6-10th July 1992.
- [Spivey89] J.M. Spivey, "The Z Notation: A Reference Manual", Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd., 1989.




Figure-5: A Template Browser. This window provides tools for the creation of ViewPoint templates and the description of their style and work plan slots. ViewPoint templates are listed in the top left window pane. The diagram shows the style slot of the selected template (Functional Decomposition) being described (textually & graphically).




Figure-6: A ViewPoint Inspector. This window provides tools for the development of ViewPoint specifications. These tools include facilities for editing (assembling) specifications and checking their consistency. The diagram shows a "typical" functional decomposition specification, with the work record shown in the two top left window panes.




Figure-7: A ViewPoint Configuration Browser. This window provides tools for creating, monitoring and managing ViewPoints. The diagram lists projects (developments) in the top left window pane. The ViewPoint Configuration Diagram for the selected project is shown in the bottom pane.