Chapter 1

Introduction

There is a demand for increasingly complicated software, the construction of which is currently beyond our ability. [Selic 2003] observes that a similar situation occurred when steam and electrical power were introduced during the Industrial Revolution [Pool 1997].

Hardware development seems to advance more quickly than software development. For example, processors become faster and provide greater functionality each year, while software seems to improve more gradually. [Kleppe *et al.* 2003] indicates that software development is perceived to lag behind hardware development because of rising complexity in software systems. Software developers now build distributed and interoperating applications with sophisticated graphical interfaces rather than insular, monolithic mainframe applications with no user interface.

[Brooks 1986] observes that engineering increasingly complicated systems with traditional development approaches presents many challenges, including:

1. *Increasing size of development teams*: large teams may experience communication difficulties, detracting from productivity.

2. *Difficulties providing system overviews*: incomplete system knowledge can impede maintenance activities.

3. *Poor understandability*: new developers suffer a complex learning curve.

4. *Resistance to change*: development reacts slowly when (1) requirements change, (2) new underlying technologies are to be adopted, and (3) unintended behaviour must be corrected.

Uhl[1] notes that software development improves radically only when systems can be defined at a higher level of abstraction. Historically, raising the level of abstraction of software development has led to increased productivity. For example, assembly language provides mnemonics for machine code, allowing developers to disregard superfluous detail (such as the binary representation of instructions). Object-orientation and functional programming permit further abstraction over assembler, enabling developers to express solutions in a manner that is more representative of their problem domain.

---

[1]Keynote address to the Fourth European Conference on Model Driven Architecture (ECMDA), June 2008, Berlin, Germany.

Improvements to development processes have also facilitated greater abstraction. For example, developers are increasingly employing models of systems to aid design and implementation. During the 1990s, methods that prescribed modelling to aid software development were popular. A common modelling language, the Unified Modelling Language (UML) [OMG 2007a], was standardised by combining the modelling languages from three methods []. By communicating designs and abstracting away from unimportant details, software engineers are using models to address the first three of Brooks's challenges. However, modelling is effective only when the models are an accurate representation of the computer system.

During a system's lifecycle, design documents are often neglected and become out-of-date. Without a well-defined connection to the system's implementation, models are effectively design documents that might be neglected and can become inaccurate representations of the system [Frankel 2002, Kleppe *et al.* 2003]. For models to be used as effective means of communication and education, they must be accurate and, therefore, must be maintained and updated in response to change. Maintaining two unconnected representations of a system (models and implementation) obviously detracts from the productivity of the development team. Instead, an approach to software development that integrates modelling and coding can be used to address this productivity problem, as well as the first three of Brooks's challenges.

1.1 Model-Driven Engineering

1.2 Software Evolution

Studies [Erlikh 2000, Moad 1990] suggest that the evolution of software can account for as much as 90% of a development budget. Such figures are sometimes described as uncertain [Sommerville 2006, ch. 21], mainly because terms such as evolution and maintenance are used ambiguously. However, precise figures are not required to see that the effects of evolution can inhibit the productivity of software development.

Studying software evolution can provide benefits other than improving the maintainability of a system. For instance, by understanding the mistakes made in the engineering of existing software systems, similar mistakes may be avoided in the future. Experts and analysts can devise best practices that guide developers away from problematic practices. For this reason, Kerievsky notes that "studying the evolution of great software designs will be more valuable than studying the great designs themselves" [Kerievsky 2004].

[Lehman 1980, Lehman 1978, Lehman 1969] identify several laws of software evolution for *evolutionary-type systems* (*E-type systems*) – systems that solve problems or implement software in the real world. E-type systems differ from *specification-type systems* (*S-type systems*) where the "sole criterion of acceptability is correctness in the mathematical sense" [Lehman 1985].

The law of *continuing change* states that "E-type systems must be continually adapted else they become progressively less satisfactory" [Lehman 1978]. Later, Lehman et al. [Lehman 1996] introduce another complementary law, the law of *declining quality*: "The quality of E-type systems will appear to be declining unless they are rigorously maintained and adapted to operational en-

vironment change". Both laws indicate that the evolution of E-type systems during their effective lifetime is inevitable.

1.3 Software Evolution Challenges in MDE

1.4 Research Hypothesis

The research presented in this thesis explores the following hypothesis:

> *In existing MDE projects, evolution is typically managed in an ad-hoc manner with little regard for re-use. Dedicated structures and processes for identifying and managing evolutionary change can be designed by analysing evolution in existing MDE projects. Furthermore, supporting those dedicated structures and processes in contemporary MDE environments is beneficial in terms of increased* **productivity**, **understandability**, *and* **portability**.

Some of the terms used in the research hypothesis are ambiguous, and require further definition. Specifically, the terms productivity, understandability and portability are defined as follows:

Productivity is a measure of the amount of work required to complete a development activity. For example, the productivity of data entry might be increased by using an Optical Character Recognition (OCR) system rather than a typist. In this scenario, the extent to which productivity might be increased is affected by at least the following: the accuracy and capabilities of the OCR system, the speed and accuracy of the typist, and the legibility and consistency of the data. In general, productivity is affected by many factors.

Understandability is a measure of the ease with which the purpose, motivation and workings of a system can be identified from the representation of that system. For example, the function of a circuit is arguably easier to understand when examining a schematic of the circuit rather than a Printed Circuit Board (PCB) that implements the circuit. For example, components are often arranged to save space on a PCB, while components might be arranged to ease understanding of the system on a schematic. Clearly, understandability is somewhat subjective. Due to differences in knowledge and experience, a representation that is easy to understand for one person may be difficult for another.

Portability is a measure of the extent to which a system can be changed to interoperate with other systems. For example, a system implemented directly in machine code can be used with only one family of machines, while an equivalent system implemented in a high-level language (and compiled to machine code) can be used with different families of machine. Hence, the latter is more portable than the former.

1.4.1 Thesis Objectives

The objectives of the thesis are to:

1. Identify and analyse evolutionary change in existing MDE projects.

2. Investigate the extent to which existing structures and processes for identifying and managing evolutionary change can be used in MDE.

3. Develop new structures and processes for identifying and managing evolutionary change in the context of MDE, and integrate those structures and processes with a contemporary MDE development environment.

4. Evaluate and assess new and existing structures and processes for identifying and managing evolutionary change, particularly with respect to productivity, understandability and portability.

1.5   Research Method

To explore the hypothesis outlined above, the thesis research was conducted using the method described in this section and summarised in Figure 1.1. The green boxes represent the three *phases* of research, which are described below. The white boxes represent inputs and outputs to those phases.

Firstly, the *analysis* phase involved identifying the ways in which evolution has occurred and has been identified and managed in existing MDE projects. The type of data obtained from the analysis phase determined the context in which the thesis research was conducted, model-metamodel co-evolution. Examples of evolution taken from existing MDE projects were used to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of existing structures and processes for identifying and managing evolution. Requirements for new structures and processes for identifying and managing evolution were formulated from the results of the analysis phase.

The *implementation* phase involved designing and implementing novel structures and processes for identifying and managing evolution, and integrating the structures and processes with a contemporary MDE environment. The examples of evolution used in the analysis phase were used for testing the implementation of the structures and processes.

The *evaluation* phase involved assessing the novel structures and processes for identifying and managing evolution by comparison to existing structures and processes. Evaluation was performed using examples of evolution from MDE projects. To mitigate a possible threat to the validity of the research, the examples used in the evaluation phase were different to those used in the analysis phase. The strengths and weaknesses of the novel and existing structures and processes were synthesised from the comparisons, particularly with respect to productivity, understandability and portability.

A similar method was used successfully in [Dig 2007] to explore the extent to which component-based applications can be automatically evolved. Initially, [Dig & Johnson 2006b] conducted *analysis* to identify and categorise evolution in five existing component-based applications, with the hypothesis that many of the changes could be classified as behaviour-preserving. By using examples from the survey, [Dig *et al.* 2006] were able to *implement* an algorithm for automatically detecting behaviour-preserving changes. The algorithm was then used to implement tools for (1) migrating code in a distributed and collaborative software development environment [Dig & Johnson 2006a], and (2) analysing the

Figure 1.1: Overview of the research method.

history of component-based applications [Dig *et al.* 2007]. The latter facilitated better understanding of program evolution, and refinement of the detection algorithm. Finally, [Dig 2007] *evaluated* the tools and detection algorithm by application to three further component-based applications.

1.6   Thesis Structure

Chapter 2 gives an overview of MDE by defining terminology; describing associated engineering principles, practices and tools; and identifying related areas of computer science. Section 2.5 synthesises some of the benefits of – and challenges to – contemporary MDE.

Chapter 3 reviews theoretical and practical software evolution research. Areas of research that underpin software evolution are described, including refactoring, design patterns, and traceability. The review then discusses work that approaches particular categories of evolution problem, such as programming language, schema and grammar evolution. Section 3.2.4 surveys work that considers the evolution of MDE development artefacts (such as models and transformations). Section 3.3 identifies three types of evolution that occur in MDE projects and highlights challenges for their management.

Chapter 4 surveys existing MDE projects and categories the types of evolution occurring in each project. From this survey, a context for the thesis research is established (a type of evolution termed model-metamodel co-evolution). Examples of evolution taken from the existing MDE projects are used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of existing structures and processes for identifying and managing evolution. From this, Section 4.2.2 identifies a process for identifying and managing evolution which has not been recognised previously in the literature, Section 4.2.3 derives a categorisation of the existing structures and processes, and Section 4.3 synthesis requirements for novel structures and processes for identifying and managing evolution.

Chapter 5 describes three novel structures and process for identifying and managing evolution in the context of MDE. The first, a metamodel-independent syntax, is used to identify – and to facilitate the reconciliation of – problems caused by evolution. The textual modelling notation described in Section 5.2 and the model migration language described in Section 5.4 are used for reconciliation of problems caused by evolution. The latter provides a means for performing reconciliation in a repeatable manner.

Chapter 6 assesses the novel structures and processes developed in Chapter 5 by comparison to existing structures and processes. To explore the research hypothesis, several different types of comparison were performed, including an experiment in which quantitive measurements were derived, a collaborative comparison of model migration tools with three MDE experts, and application to a large, independent example of evolution taken from a real-world MDE project.

Chapter 7 summarises the achievements of the research, and discusses results in the context of the research hypothesis. Limitations of the thesis research and areas of future work are also outlined.

Bibliography

[37-Signals 2008]   37-Signals. Ruby on Rails [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.rubyonrails.org/`, 2008.

[Ackoff 1962]   Russell L. Ackoff. *Scientific Method: Optimizing Applied Research Decisions.* John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

[Aizenbud-Reshef *et al.* 2005]   N. Aizenbud-Reshef, R.F. Paige, J. Rubin, Y. Shaham-Gafni, and D.S. Kolovos. Operational semantics for traceability. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA Workshop on Traceability*, pages 8–14, 2005.

[Alexander *et al.* 1977]   Christopher Alexander, Sara Ishikawa, and Murray Silverstein. *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction (Center for Environmental Structure Series).* Oxford University Press, 1977.

[Álvarez *et al.* 2001]   José Álvarez, Andy Evans, and Paul Sammut. MML and the metamodel architecture. In *Proc. Workshop on Transformation in UML*, 2001.

[Apostel 1960]   Leo Apostel. Towards the formal study of models in the non-formal sciences. *Synthese*, 12:125–161, 1960.

[Arendt *et al.* 2009]   Thorsten Arendt, Florian Mantz, Lars Schneider, and Gabriele Taentzer. Model refactoring in eclipse by LTK, EWL, and EMF Refactor: A case study. In *Proc. Joint MoDSE-MCCM Workshop*, 2009.

[ATLAS 2007]   ATLAS. Atlas Transformation Language Project Website [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/m2m/atl/`, 2007.

[Backus 1978]   John Backus. The history of FORTRAN I, II and III. *History of Programming Languages*, 1:165–180, 1978.

[Balazinska *et al.* 2000]   Magdalena Balazinska, Ettore Merlo, Michel Dagenais, Bruno Lagüe, and Kostas Kontogiannis. Advanced clone-analysis to support object-oriented system refactoring. In *Proc. Working Conference on Reverse Engineering*, pages 98–107. IEEE Computer Society, 2000.

[Banerjee *et al.* 1987]   Jay Banerjee, Won Kim, Hyoung-Joo Kim, and Henry F. Korth. Semantics and implementation of schema evolution in object-oriented databases. In *Proc. Special Interest Group on Management of Data*, volume 16, pages 311–322. ACM, 1987.

[Beck & Cunningham 1989] Kent Beck and Ward Cunningham. Constructing abstractions for object-oriented applications. *Journal of Object Oriented Programming*, 2, 1989.

[Bézivin & Gerbé 2001] Jean Bézivin and Olivier Gerbé. Towards a precise definition of the OMG/MDA framework. In *Proc. ASE*, pages 273–280. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.

[Bézivin 2005] Jean Bézivin. On the unification power of models. *Software and System Modeling*, 4(2):171–188, 2005.

[Biermann *et al.* 2006] Enrico Biermann, Karsten Ehrig, Christian Köhler, Günter Kuhns, Gabriele Taentzer, and Eduard Weiss. Emf model refactoring based on graph transformation concepts. *ECEASST*, 3, 2006.

[Bloch 2005] Joshua Bloch. How to design a good API and why it matters [online]. Keynote address to the LCSD Workshop at OOPSLA, October 2005, San Diego, United States of America. [Accessed 23 July 2009] Available at: `http://lcsd05.cs.tamu.edu/slides/keynote.pdf`, 2005.

[Bohner 2002] Shawn A. Bohner. Software change impacts - an evolving perspective. In *Proc. International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM)*, pages 263–272. IEEE Computer Society, 2002.

[Bosch 1998] Jan Bosch. Design patterns as language constructs. *Journal of Object Oriented Programming*, 11(2):18–32, 1998.

[Briand *et al.* 2003] Lionel C. Briand, Yvan Labiche, and L. O'Sullivan. Impact analysis and change management of uml models. In *Proc. International Conference on Software Maintenance (ICSM)*, pages 256–265. IEEE Computer Society, 2003.

[Brooks 1986] Frederick P. Brooks. No silver bullet – essence and accident in software engineering (invited paper). In *Proc. International Federation for Information Processing*, pages 1069–1076, 1986.

[Brown *et al.* 1998] William J. Brown, Raphael C. Malveau, Hays W. McCormick III, and Thomas J. Mowbray. *Anti Patterns*. Wiley, 1998.

[Cervelle *et al.* 2006] Julien Cervelle, Rémi Forax, and Gilles Roussel. Tatoo: an innovative parser generator. In *Principles and Practice of Programming in Java*, pages 13–20. ACM, 2006.

[Ceteva 2008] Ceteva. XMF – the extensible programming language [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.ceteva.com/xmf.html`, 2008.

[Chen & Chou 1999] J.Y.J. Chen and S.C. Chou. Consistency management in a process environment. *Systems and Software*, 47(2-3):105–110, 1999.

[Cicchetti *et al.* 2008] Antonio Cicchetti, Davide Di Ruscio, Romina Eramo, and Alfonso Pierantonio. Automating co-evolution in model-driven engineering. In *Proc. EDOC*, pages 222–231. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.

[Clark *et al.* 2008]   Tony Clark, Paul Sammut, and James Willians. Superlanguages: Developing languages and applications with XMF [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.ceteva.com/docs/Superlanguages.pdf`, 2008.

[Cleland-Huang *et al.* 2003]   Jane Cleland-Huang, Carl K. Chang, and Mark Christensen. Event-based traceability for managing evolutionary change. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 29(9):796–810, 2003.

[Costa & Silva 2007]   M. Costa and A.R. da Silva. RT-MDD framework – a practical approach. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA Workshop on Traceability*, pages 17–26, 2007.

[Czarnecki & Helsen 2006]   Krzysztof Czarnecki and Simon Helsen. Feature-based survey of model transformation approaches. *IBM Systems Journal*, 45(3):621–646, 2006.

[Deursen *et al.* 2000]   Arie van Deursen, Paul Klint, and Joost Visser. Domain-specific languages: An annotated bibliography. *SIGPLAN Notices*, 35(6):26–36, 2000.

[Deursen *et al.* 2007]   Arie van Deursen, Eelco Visser, and Jos Warmer. Model-driven software evolution: A research agenda. In *Proc. Workshop on Model-Driven Software Evolution*, pages 41–49, 2007.

[Dig & Johnson 2006a]   Danny Dig and Ralph Johnson. Automated upgrading of component-based applications. In *OOPSLA Companion*, pages 675–676, 2006.

[Dig & Johnson 2006b]   Danny Dig and Ralph Johnson. How do APIs evolve? A story of refactoring. *Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution*, 18(2):83–107, 2006.

[Dig *et al.* 2006]   Danny Dig, Can Comertoglu, Darko Marinov, and Ralph Johnson. Automated detection of refactorings in evolving components. In *Proc. European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming*, volume 4067 of *LNCS*, pages 404–428. Springer, 2006.

[Dig *et al.* 2007]   Danny Dig, Kashif Manzoor, Ralph Johnson, and Tien N. Nguyen. Refactoring-aware configuration management for object-oriented programs. In *Proc. International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 427–436. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.

[Dig 2007]   Daniel Dig. *Automated Upgrading of Component-Based Applications*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA, 2007.

[Dmitriev 2004]   Sergey Dmitriev. Language oriented programming: The next programming paradigm. *JetBrains onBoard [online]*, 1, 2004. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.onboard.jetbrains.com/is1/articles/04/10/lop/`.

[Drivalos *et al.* 2008]   Nicholas Drivalos, Richard F. Paige, Kiran J. Fernandes, and Dimitrios S. Kolovos. Towards rigorously defined model-to-model traceability. In *Proc. European Conference on the Model Driven Architecture Workshop on Traceability*, 2008.

[Ducasse *et al.* 1999]   Stéphane Ducasse, Matthias Rieger, and Serge Demeyer. A language independent approach for detecting duplicated code. In *Proc. International Conference on Software Maintenance*, pages 109–118. IEEE Computer Society, 1999.

[Eclipse 2008a]   Eclipse. Eclipse Modeling Framework project [online]. [Accessed 22 January 2009] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/modeling/emf/`, 2008.

[Eclipse 2008b]   Eclipse. Eclipse project [online]. [Accessed 20 January 2009] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org`, 2008.

[Eclipse 2008c]   Eclipse. Epsilon home page [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/gmt/epsilon/`, 2008.

[Eclipse 2008d]   Eclipse. Generative Modelling Technologies project [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/gmt`, 2008.

[Eclipse 2009a]   Eclipse. Model Development Tools project [online]. [Accessed 6 January 2008] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/modeling/mdt/`, 2009.

[Eclipse 2009b]   Eclipse. UML2 Model Development Tools project [online]. [Accessed 7 September 2009] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/modeling/mdt/uml2`, 2009.

[Eclipse 2010]   Eclipse. Connected Data Objects Model Repository Project Website [online]. [Accessed 15 February 2010] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/modeling/emf/?project=cdo#cdo`, 2010.

[Edelweiss & Freitas Moreira 2005]   Nina Edelweiss and Álvaro Freitas Moreira. Temporal and versioning model for schema evolution in object-oriented databases. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 53(2):99–128, 2005.

[Elmasri & Navathe 2006]   Ramez Elmasri and Shamkant B. Navathe. *Fundamentals of Database Systems*. Addison-Wesley Longman, 2006.

[Erlikh 2000]   Len Erlikh. Leveraging legacy system dollars for e-business. *IT Professional*, 2(3):17–23, 2000.

[Evans 2004]   E. Evans. *Domain-Driven Design: Tacking Complexity In the Heart of Software*. Addison-Wesley, Boston, MA, USA, 2004.

[Feathers 2004]   Michael C. Feathers. *Working Effectively with Legacy Code*. Prentice Hall, 2004.

[Ferrandina *et al.* 1995]   Fabrizio Ferrandina, Thorsten Meyer, Roberto Zicari, Guy Ferran, and Joëlle Madec. Schema and database evolution in the O2 object database system. In *Very Large Data Bases*, pages 170–181. Morgan Kaufmann, 1995.

[Fowler 1999]   Martin Fowler. *Refactoring: improving the design of existing code*. Addison-Wesley, 1999.

[Fowler 2002]   Martin Fowler. *Patterns of Enterprise Application Architecture.* Addison-Wesley, 2002.

[Fowler 2005]   Martin Fowler. Language workbenches: The killer-app for domain specific languages? [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.martinfowler.com/articles/languageWorkbench.html`, 2005.

[Fowler 2010]   Martin Fowler. *Domain Specific Languages.* Addison-Wesley Professional, 2010.

[Frankel 2002]   David Frankel. *Model Driven Architecture: Applying MDA to Enterprise Computing.* Wiley, 2002.

[Frenzel 2006]   Leif Frenzel. The language toolkit: An API for automated refactorings in eclipse-based IDEs [online]. [Accessed 02 August 2010] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/articles/Article-LTK/ltk.html`, 2006.

[Fritzsche *et al.* 2008]   M. Fritzsche, J. Johannes, S. Zschaler, A. Zherebtsov, and A. Terekhov. Application of tracing techniques in Model-Driven Performance Engineering. In *Proc. ECMDA Traceability Workshop (ECMDA-TW)*, pages 111–120, 2008.

[Fuhrer *et al.* 2007]   Robert M. Fuhrer, Adam Kiezun, and Markus Keller. Refactoring in the Eclipse JDT: Past, present, and future. In *Proc. Workshop on Refactoring Tools*, 2007.

[Gamma *et al.* 1995]   Erich Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, and John Vlissides. *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software.* Addison-Wesley, 1995.

[Garcés *et al.* 2009]   Kelly Garcés, Frédéric Jouault, Pierre Cointe, and Jean Bézivin. Managing model adaptation by precise detection of metamodel changes. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA*, volume 5562 of *LNCS*, pages 34–49. Springer, 2009.

[Gosling *et al.* 2005]   James Gosling, Bill Joy, Guy Steele, and Gilad Bracha. *The Java^{TM} Language Specification.* Addison-Wesley, Boston, MA, USA, 2005.

[Graham 1993]   Paul Graham. *On Lisp: Advanced Techniques for Common Lisp.* Prentice-Hall, 1993.

[Greenfield *et al.* 2004]   Jack Greenfield, Keith Short, Steve Cook, and Stuart Kent. *Software Factories: Assembling Applications with Patterns, Models, Frameworks, and Tools.* Wiley, 2004.

[Gronback 2009]   R.C. Gronback. *Eclipse Modeling Project: A Domain-Specific Language (DSL) Toolkit.* Addison-Wesley Professional, 2009.

[Gruschko *et al.* 2007]   Boris Gruschko, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, and Richard F. Paige. Towards synchronizing models with evolving metamodels. In *Proc. Workshop on Model-Driven Software Evolution*, 2007.

[Guerrini *et al.* 2005]   Giovanna Guerrini, Marco Mesiti, and Daniele Rossi. Impact of XML schema evolution on valid documents. In *Proc. Workshop on Web Information and Data Management*, pages 39–44, 2005.

[Hearnden *et al.* 2006]   David Hearnden, Michael Lawley, and Kerry Raymond. Incremental model transformation for the evolution of model-driven systems. In *Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*, volume 4199 of *LNCS*, pages 321–335. Springer, 2006.

[Heidenreich *et al.* 2009]   Florian Heidenreich, Jendrik Johannes, Sven Karol, Mirko Seifert, and Christian Wende. Derivation and refinement of textual syntax for models. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA*, volume 5562 of *LNCS*, pages 114–129. Springer, 2009.

[Herrmannsdoerfer *et al.* 2008]   Markus Herrmannsdoerfer, Sebastian Benz, and Elmar Juergens. Automatability of coupled evolution of metamodels and models in practice. In *Proc. International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*, volume 5301 of *LNCS*, pages 645–659. Springer, 2008.

[Herrmannsdoerfer *et al.* 2009a]   M. Herrmannsdoerfer, D. Ratiu, and G. Wachsmuth. Language evolution in practice. In *Proc. SLE*, volume 5696 of *LNCS*, pages 3–22. Springer, 2009.

[Herrmannsdoerfer *et al.* 2009b]   Markus Herrmannsdoerfer, Sebastian Benz, and Elmar Juergens. COPE - automating coupled evolution of metamodels and models. In *Proc. ECOOP*, volume 5653 of *LNCS*, pages 52–76. Springer, 2009.

[Hussey & Paternostro 2006]   Kenn Hussey and Marcelo Paternostro. Advanced features of EMF. Tutorial at EclipseCon 2006, California, USA. [Accessed 07 September 2009] Available at: `http://www.eclipsecon.org/2006/Sub.do?id=171`, 2006.

[IBM 2005]   IBM. Emfatic Language for EMF Development [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.alphaworks.ibm.com/tech/emfatic`, 2005.

[INRIA 2007]   INRIA. AMMA project page [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://wiki.eclipse.org/AMMA`, 2007.

[IRISA 2007]   IRISA. Sintaks. `http://www.kermeta.org/sintaks/`, 2007.

[ISO/IEC 1996]   Information Technology ISO/IEC. Syntactic metalanguage – Extended BNF. ISO 14977:1996 International Standard, 1996.

[ISO/IEC 2002]   Information Technology ISO/IEC. Z Formal Specification Notation – Syntax, Type System and Semantics. ISO 13568:2002 International Standard, 2002.

[Jackson 1995]   M. Jackson. *Software Requirements and Specifications: A Lexicon of Practice, Principles and Prejudices*. ACM Press, 1995.

[JetBrains 2008]   JetBrains. MPS – Meta Programming System [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.jetbrains.com/mps/index.html`, 2008.

[Jouault & Kurtev 2005]   Frédéric Jouault and Ivan Kurtev. Transforming models with ATL. In *Proc. Satellite Events at the International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*, volume 3844 of *LNCS*, pages 128–138. Springer, 2005.

[Jouault 2005]   Frédéric Jouault. Loosely coupled traceability for ATL. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA Workshop on Traceability*, 2005.

[Kataoka *et al.* 2001]   Yoshio Kataoka, Michael D. Ernst, William G. Griswold, and David Notkin. Automated support for program refactoring using invariants. In *Proc. International Conference on Software Maintenance*, pages 736–743. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.

[Kelly & Tolvanen 2008]   Steven Kelly and Juha-Pekka Tolvanen. *Domain-Specific Modelling*. Wiley, 2008.

[Kerievsky 2004]   Joshua Kerievsky. *Refactoring to Patterns*. Addison-Wesley, 2004.

[Kleppe *et al.* 2003]   Anneke G. Kleppe, Jos Warmer, and Wim Bast. *MDA Explained: The Model Driven Architecture: Practice and Promise*. Addison-Wesley, 2003.

[Klint *et al.* 2003]   P. Klint, R. Lämmel, and C. Verhoef. Towards an engineering discipline for grammarware. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering Methodology*, 14:331–380, 2003.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2006a]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Merging models with the epsilon merging language (eml). In *Proc. MoDELS*, volume 4199 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 215–229. Springer, 2006.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2006b]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Model comparison: a foundation for model composition and model transformation testing. In *Proc. Workshop on Global Integrated Model Management*, pages 13–20, 2006.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2006c]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. The Epsilon Object Language (EOL). In *Proc. ECMDA-FA*, volume 4066 of *LNCS*, pages 128–142. Springer, 2006.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2007a]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, Fiona A.C. Polack, and Louis M. Rose. Update transformations in the small with the Epsilon Wizard Language. *Journal of Object Technology*, 6(9):53–69, 2007.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2007b]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, Louis M. Rose, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Bridging the Epsilon Wizard Language and the Eclipse Graphical Modeling Framework. In *Proc. Eclipse Summit*, Ludwigsburg, Germany, 2007.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2008a]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona Po-
lack. The Epsilon Transformation Language. In *Proc. ICMT*, volume 5063
of *LNCS*, pages 46–60. Springer, 2008.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2008b]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C.
Polack. On the evolution of OCL for capturing structural constraints in
modelling languages. In *Proc. Workshop on Rigorous Methods for Software
Construction and Analysis*, 2008.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2008c]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C.
Polack. Scalability : The holy grail of model driven engineering. In *Proc.
Workshop on Challenges in Model Driven Engineering*, 2008.

[Kolovos *et al.* 2009]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and
Louis M. Rose.   EuGENia: GMF for mortals.   Long talk at
Eclipse Summit Europe, October 2009, Ludwigsburg, Germany. Avail-
able at: `https://www.eclipsecon.org/submissions/ese2009/`
`view_talk.php?id=979` [Accessed 12 April 2010], 2009.

[Kolovos 2009]   Dimitrios S. Kolovos. *An Extensible Platform for Specification
of Integrated Languages for Model Management.* PhD thesis, University of
York, United Kingdom, 2009.

[Kramer 2001]   Diane Kramer. XEM: XML Evolution Management. Master's
thesis, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, MA, USA, 2001.

[Kurtev 2004]   Ivan Kurtev. *Adaptability of Model Transformations.* PhD
thesis, University of Twente, Netherlands, 2004.

[Lago *et al.* 2009]   Patricia Lago, Henry Muccini, and Hans van Vliet. A scoped
approach to traceability management. *Systems and Software*, 82(1):168–
182, 2009.

[Lämmel & Verhoef 2001]   R. Lämmel and C. Verhoef. Semi-automatic gram-
mar recovery. *Software - Practice and Experience*, 31(15):1395–1438, 2001.

[Lämmel 2001]   R. Lämmel. Grammar adaptation. In *Proc. Formal Methods
for Increasing Software Productivity (FME), International Symposium of
Formal Methods Europe*, volume 2021 of *LNCS*, pages 550–570. Springer,
2001.

[Lämmel 2002]   R. Lämmel. Towards generic refactoring. In *Proc. ACM SIG-
PLAN Workshop on Rule-Based Programming*, pages 15–28. ACM, 2002.

[Lehman 1969]   Meir M. Lehman. The programming process. Technical report,
IBM Res. Rep. RC 2722, 1969.

[Lehman 1978]   Meir M. Lehman. Programs, cities, students - limits to growth?
Programming Methodology, pages 42–62, 1978.

[Lehman 1980]   Meir M. Lehman. On understanding laws, evolution, and con-
servation in the large-program life cycle. *Journal of Systems and Software*,
1:213–221, 1980.

[Lehman 1985]   Meir M. Lehman. *Program evolution: processes of software change.* Academic, 1985.

[Lehman 1996]   Meir M. Lehman. Laws of software evolution revisited. In *Proc. European Workshop on Software Process Technology*, pages 108–124, 1996.

[Lerner 2000]   Barbara Staudt Lerner. A model for compound type changes encountered in schema evolution. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 25(1):83–127, 2000.

[Mäder *et al.* 2008]   P. Mäder, O. Gotel, and I. Philippow. Rule-based maintenance of post-requirements traceability relations. In *Proc. IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE)*, pages 23–32, 2008.

[Martin & Martin 2006]   R.C. Martin and M. Martin. *Agile Principles, Patterns, and Practices in C#.* Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2006.

[McCarthy 1978]   John McCarthy. History of Lisp. *History of Programming Languages*, 1:217–223, 1978.

[McNeile 2003]   Ashley McNeile. MDA: The vision with the hole? [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.metamaxim.com/download/documents/MDAv1.pdf`, 2003.

[Mellor & Balcer 2002]   Stephen J. Mellor and Marc Balcer. *Executable UML: A Foundation for Model-Driven Architectures.* Addison-Wesley Longman, 2002.

[Melnik 2004]   Sergey Melnik. *Generic Model Management: Concepts and Algorithms.* PhD thesis, University of Leipzig, Germany, 2004.

[Mens & Demeyer 2007]   Tom Mens and Serge Demeyer. *Software Evolution.* Springer-Verlag, 2007.

[Mens & Tourwé 2004]   Tom Mens and Tom Tourwé. A survey of software refactoring. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 30(2):126–139, 2004.

[Mens *et al.* 2007]   Tom Mens, Gabriele Taentzer, and Dirk Müller. Challenges in model refactoring. In *Proc. Workshop on Object-Oriented Reengineering*, 2007.

[Merriam-Webster 2010]   Merriam-Webster. Definition of Nuclear Family. `http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nuclear%20family`, 2010.

[Moad 1990]   J Moad. Maintaining the competitive edge. *Datamation*, 36(4):61–66, 1990.

[Moha *et al.* 2009]   Naouel Moha, Vincent Mahé, Olivier Barais, and Jean-Marc Jézéquel. Generic model refactorings. In *Proc. MoDELS*, volume 5795 of *LNCS*, pages 628–643. Springer, 2009.

[Muller & Hassenforder 2005]   Pierre-Alain Muller and Michel Hassenforder. HUTN as a Bridge between ModelWare and GrammarWare. In *Proc. Workshop in Software Modelling Engineering*, 2005.

[Nentwich *et al.* 2003]   C. Nentwich, W. Emmerich, A. Finkelstein, and E. Ellmer. Flexible consistency checking. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 12(1):28–63, 2003.

[Nguyen *et al.* 2005]   Tien Nhut Nguyen, Cheng Thao, and Ethan V. Munson. On product versioning for hypertexts. In *Proc. International Workshop on Software Configuration Management (SCM)*, pages 113–132. ACM, 2005.

[Oldevik *et al.* 2005]   Jon Oldevik, Tor Neple, Roy Grønmo, Jan Øyvind Aagedal, and Arne-Jørgen Berre. Toward standardised model to text transformations. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA*, volume 3748 of *LNCS*, pages 239–253. Springer, 2005.

[Olsen & Oldevik 2007]   Gøran K. Olsen and Jon Oldevik. Scenarios of traceability in model to text transformations. In *Proc. ECMDA-FA*, volume 4530 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 144–156. Springer, 2007.

[OMG 2001]   OMG. Unified Modelling Language 1.4 Specification [online]. [Accessed 15 September 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/1.4/`, 2001.

[OMG 2004]   OMG. Human-Usable Textual Notation 1.0 Specification [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/technology/documents/formal/hutn.htm`, 2004.

[OMG 2005]   OMG. MOF QVT Final Adopted Specication [online]. [Accessed 22 July 2009] Available at: `www.omg.org/docs/ptc/05-11-01.pdf`, 2005.

[OMG 2006]   OMG. Object Constraint Language 2.0 Specification [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/technology/documents/formal/ocl.htm`, 2006.

[OMG 2007a]   OMG. Unified Modelling Language 2.1.2 Specification [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/2.1.2/`, 2007.

[OMG 2007b]   OMG. Unified Modelling Language 2.2 Specification [online]. [Accessed 5 March 2010] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/2.2/`, 2007.

[OMG 2007c]   OMG. XML Metadata Interchange 2.1.1 Specification [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/technology/documents/formal/xmi.htm`, 2007.

[OMG 2008a]   OMG. Meta-Object Facility [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/mof`, 2008.

[OMG 2008b]   OMG. Model Driven Architecture [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org/mda/`, 2008.

[OMG 2008c]   OMG. Object Management Group home page [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.omg.org`, 2008.

[Opdyke 1992]   William F. Opdyke. *Refactoring Object-Oriented Frameworks.* PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA, 1992.

[openArchitectureWare 2007]   openArchitectureWare. openArchitectureWare Project Website [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.eclipse.org/gmt/oaw/`, 2007.

[openArchitectureWare 2008]   openArchitectureWare. XPand Language Reference [online]. [Accessed 18 August 2010] Available at: `http://wiki.eclipse.org/AMMA`, 2008.

[Paige *et al.* 2007]   Richard F. Paige, Phillip J. Brooke, and Jonathan S. Ostroff. Metamodel-based model conformance and multiview consistency checking. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 16(3), 2007.

[Paige *et al.* 2009]   Richard F. Paige, Louis M. Rose, Xiaocheng Ge, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, and Phillip J. Brooke. FPTC: Automated safety analysis for domain-specific languages. In *MoDELS Workshops and Symposia*, volume 5421 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 229–242. Springer, 2009.

[Parr 2007]   Terence Parr. *The Definitive ANTLR Reference: Building Domain-Specific Languages.* Pragmatic Programmers, 2007.

[Patrascoiu & Rodgers 2004]   Octavian Patrascoiu and Peter Rodgers. Embedding OCL expressions in YATL. In *Proc. OCL and Model-Driven Engineering Workshop*, 2004.

[Pilgrim *et al.* 2008]   Jens von Pilgrim, Bert Vanhooff, Immo Schulz-Gerlach, and Yolande Berbers. Constructing and visualizing transformation chains. In *Proc. European Conference on the Model Driven Architecture – Foundations and Applications*, volume 5095 of *LNCS*, pages 17–32. Springer, 2008.

[Pizka & Jürgens 2007]   M. Pizka and E. Jürgens. Automating language evolution. In *Proc. Joint IEEE/IFIP Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Software Engineering (TASE)*, pages 305–315. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.

[Pool 1997]   R. Pool. *Beyond Engineering: How Society Shapes Technology.* Oxford University Press, 1997.

[Porres 2003]   Ivan Porres. Model refactorings as rule-based update transformations. In *Proc. UML*, volume 2863 of *LNCS*, pages 159–174. Springer, 2003.

[Ráth *et al.* 2008]   István Ráth, Gábor Bergmann, András Ökrös, and Dániel Varró. Live model transformations driven by incremental pattern matching. In *Proc. ICMT*, volume 5063 of *LNCS*, pages 107–121. Springer, 2008.

[Rising 2001]   Linda Rising, editor. *Design patterns in communications software*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[Rose *et al.* 2008]   Louis M. Rose, Richard F. Paige, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, and Fiona A.C. Polack. The Epsilon Generation Language. In *Proc. European Conference on Model Driven Architecture – Foundations and Applications*, volume 5095 of *LNCS*, pages 1–16. Springer, 2008.

[Rose *et al.* 2009a]   Louis M. Rose, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Enhanced automation for managing model and metamodel inconsistency. In *Proc. ASE*, pages 545–549. ACM Press, 2009.

[Rose *et al.* 2009b]   Louis M. Rose, Richard F. Paige, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, and Fiona A.C. Polack. An analysis of approaches to model migration. In *Proc. Joint MoDSE-MCCM Workshop*, 2009.

[Rose *et al.* 2010a]   Louis M. Rose, Markus Herrmannsdoerfer, James R. Williams, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Kelly Garcés, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. A comparison of model migration tools. In *Proc. MoDELS*, volume TBC of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, page TBC. Springer, 2010.

[Rose *et al.* 2010b]   Louis M. Rose, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Nicholas Drivalos, James. R. Williams, Richard F. Paige, Fiona A.C. Polack, and Kiran J. Fernandes. Concordance: An efficient framework for managing model integrity [submitted to]. In *Proc. European Conference on Modelling Foundations and Applications*, volume 6138 of *LNCS*, pages 62–73. Springer, 2010.

[Rose *et al.* 2010c]   Louis M. Rose, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Migrating activity diagrams with Epsilon Flock. In *Proc. TTC*, 2010.

[Rose *et al.* 2010d]   Louis M. Rose, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Model migration case. In *Proc. TTC*, 2010.

[Rose *et al.* 2010e]   Louis M. Rose, Dimitrios S. Kolovos, Richard F. Paige, and Fiona A.C. Polack. Model migration with Epsilon Flock. In *Proc. ICMT*, volume 6142 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 184–198. Springer, 2010.

[Selic 2003]   Bran Selic. The pragmatics of Model-Driven Development. *IEEE Software*, 20(5):19–25, 2003.

[Selic 2005]   Bran Selic. Whats new in UML 2.0? *IBM Rational software*, 2005.

[Sendall & Kozaczynski 2003]   Shane Sendall and Wojtek Kozaczynski. Model transformation: The heart and soul of model-driven software development. *IEEE Software*, 20:42–45, 2003.

[Sjøberg 1993]   Dag I.K. Sjøberg. Quantifying schema evolution. *Information & Software Technology*, 35(1):35–44, 1993.

[Sommerville 2006]   Ian Sommerville. *Software Engineering*. Addison-Wesley Longman, 2006.

[Sprinkle & Karsai 2004]   Jonathan Sprinkle and Gábor Karsai. A domain-specific visual language for domain model evolution. *Journal of Visual Languages and Computing*, 15(3-4):291–307, 2004.

[Sprinkle 2003]   Jonathan Sprinkle. *Metamodel Driven Model Migration*. PhD thesis, Vanderbilt University, TN, USA, 2003.

[Sprinkle 2008]   Jonathan Sprinkle. *Difference Representation and Conflict Management in Model-Driven Engineering*. PhD thesis, Universita' degli Studi dell'Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy, 2008.

[Stahl *et al.* 2006]   Thomas Stahl, Markus Voelter, and Krzysztof Czarnecki. *Model-Driven Software Development: Technology, Engineering, Management*. Wiley, 2006.

[Starfield *et al.* 1990]   M. Starfield, K.A. Smith, and A.L. Bleloch. *How to model it: Problem Solving for the Computer Age*. McGraw-Hill, 1990.

[Steinberg *et al.* 2008]   Dave Steinberg, Frank Budinsky, Marcelo Paternostro, and Ed Merks. *EMF: Eclipse Modeling Framework*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2008.

[Su *et al.* 2001]   Hong Su, Diane Kramer, Li Chen, Kajal T. Claypool, and Elke A. Rundensteiner. XEM: Managing the evolution of XML documents. In *Proc. Workshop on Research Issues in Data Engineering*, pages 103–110, 2001.

[Tratt 2008]   Laurence Tratt. A change propagating model transformation language. *Journal of Object Technology*, 7(3):107–124, 2008.

[Varró & Balogh 2007]   Dániel Varró and András Balogh. The model transformation language of the VIATRA2 framework. *Science of Computer Programming*, 68(3):187–207, 2007.

[Vries & Roddick 2004]   Denise de Vries and John F. Roddick. Facilitating database attribute domain evolution using meso-data. In *Proc. Workshop on Evolution and Change in Data Management*, pages 429–440, 2004.

[W3C 2007a]   W3C. W3C XML Schema 1.1 Specification [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.w3.org/XML/Schema`, 2007.

[W3C 2007b]   W3C. World Wide Web Consortium [online]. [Accessed 30 June 2008] Available at: `http://www.w3.org/`, 2007.

[Wachsmuth 2007]   Guido Wachsmuth. Metamodel adaptation and model co-adaptation. In *Proc. ECOOP*, volume 4609 of *LNCS*, pages 600–624. Springer, 2007.

[Wallace 2005]   Malcolm Wallace. Modular architectural representation and analysis of fault propagation and transformation. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 141(3):53–71, 2005.

[Ward 1994]   Martin P. Ward. Language-oriented programming. *Software —
          Concepts and Tools*, 15(4):147–161, 1994.

[Watson 2008]   Andrew Watson. A brief history of MDA. *Upgrade*, 9(2), 2008.

[Winkler & Pilgrim 2009]   Stefan Winkler and Jens von Pilgrim. A survey
          of traceability in requirements engineering and model-driven development.
          Software and Systems Modeling, December 2009.