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Abstract: The main goal of this work is to present a process for Software Product Lines (SPL) scoping focused on early consideration of software product quality. Product Line Scoping is the first phase of SPL Engineering (SPLE), in the Domain Engineering (DE) lifecycle, where the SPL long-term feasibility must be determined. The PLScnP process proposed here for SPL scoping, is an adaptation of the general PL Scoping phase defined in the new ISO/IEC 26550 standard describing a reference model or framework for SPL, and it concerns three main stages, Portfolio Scoping, Domain Scoping and Asset Scoping. In this work, the complete PLScnP is outlined, but only the Domain Scoping phase will be detailed and applied. General guidelines on “What to do”, as the majority of standards offer, are defined in ISO/IEC 26550. Our PLScnP complements this framework by presenting the “How to do”, offering precise technics and artefacts to be applied and constructed, and by considering early and systematically quality issues; this will allow reduction of the development effort in the subsequent DE phases, Domain Requirements Engineering and Domain Design, where the major effort is concentrated SPL development workload. The Domain Scoping step of PLScnP will be applied to the Healthcare Information Systems domain.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Software Product Lines (SPL), or simply Product Lines (PL), is an approach that provides a way of massive personalization of individual solutions from a repository of reusable software assets, in a particular domain; it is inspired in the Fordism technique used to increase production while lowering costs in early 20th century automotive industry. The term domain is often used in reference to a particular knowledge area; an application domain denotes any aspect where computing can be applied [1]; a domain is defined by Béard as the minimal set of properties describing precisely a family of problems in which a computational application or system is involved for their solution [2], and this is the definition adopted in this context. The problem of software development based on reusing components or a core of software elements, favouring efficient and reliable development is not new [3][4][5][6] and it is a complex problem not yet completely solved in academic or industrial practices; moreover, there is still a huge gap between research results and their industrial application [7][8].

The SPL development, also called SPL Engineering (SPLE) [9], aims to promote maximal reuse exploiting common elements in similar products of the SPL family in a particular domain. The main idea, but not an easy task, is to capture the essential common elements and possible variable issues to construct an evolutionary SPL, since it must manage changes and last over time to provide an economic payback. Instead of describing a single system, the SPL model describes a set or family of software systems, products or applications. Complex domain analysis must be achieved in order to specify and delimit the family that can be developed from the core of assets, with their commonality and variability [3][4][10].

This work is framed within the Domain Engineering (DE), first lifecycle of SPL, where the major development effort is concentrated in constructing the SPL Reference Architecture (RA) and Core Asset Repository (see Figure 1). The main goal of this paper is to present and apply a PL scoping process, called PLScnP (PL Scoping Process), with precise techniques and artifacts, adapting the PL Scoping phase or initial DE phase, defined in the Reference Model of the new standard ISO/IEC 26550 [7][8][11]. Notice, in general that standards or general frameworks specify the “What to do”, however the details of the “How to do” have always to be properly defined; even if in [11] a list of available techniques and methods are provided, how to combine or adapt them to the SPL context to achieve a particular activity is not specified. Our work complements the SPL standard framework, offering explicit technics to be applied to perform PL Scoping activities. In particular, for the study of domain existing products in the Portfolio Scoping step, a bottom-up process [12] can be considered, providing as output an initial candidate architecture; moreover, the ISO/IEC 25010 quality model [13] is used to specify quality properties related to functional (FR) and non functional requirements (NFR), and BPMN1 [14] is proposed to specify the domain model. Our PLScnP emphasizes software product quality assurance at early stages of SPL: quality properties and their traceability w.r.t. FR and NFR requirements has been poorly considered in general SPL

---

1 Business process Modeling Notation
development, playing however a major role in the SPL variability and evolutionary capacity. In this work, the Domain Scoping phase will be applied to the Healthcare Information Systems domain to obtain a first draft of a domain model.

Usual approaches focus more on products’ features directly perceived by users [15], which is not the case of quality properties that appear as “implicit functionality” often later on during the SPL development; nevertheless, quality requirements are responsible of most of the SPL variability at the moment of deriving concrete SPL products during the Application Engineering (AE) or second SPL lifecycle [16][17]. Figure 1 shows the ISO/IEC 26550 SPL Reference Model [11]. If quality properties are not considered early in the DE lifecycle of the SPL development, the global quality of the products derived from RA cannot be guaranteed, compromising organizational goals and the whole SPL ROI (return of inversion).

Besides this introduction and the conclusion, the structure of this paper is the following: some related works are discussed in Section 2; Section 3 describes the SPL Domain Engineering guidelines of the ISO/IEC 26550 standard; Section 4 presents PLScop, as an adaption of the PI Scoping phase [11]. Finally, Section 5 is dedicated to the application of the Domain Scoping step of PLScop to a case study in the Healthcare Information Systems domain.

Figure 1: ISO/IEC 26550 Reference Model for Software and Systems Product Lines

2. RELATED WORKS

In what follows, some related works relevant to the subject of SPL scoping, context of this research, are discussed:

An SDR (Systematic Documental Review) [18] is presented in [19] to identify best practices, challenges and limitations of the SPL scoping phase; this study points out that scoping is important and even essential for the achievement of the product line. Its main goal is to determine the feasibility of the SPL, identifying crucial aspects such as products that will conform the SPL, risks, potential reuse and costs to implement main assets. An important question related with our work is the following: How is the SPL development affected by the scoping phase? It is clear that the artefacts produced during this phase are input to the DRE phase and should reduce the effort also in subsequent phases. The study claims that the majority of the approaches reviewed do not have a clear understanding of the relation between scoping and DRE phases. In this sense, our proposition to use Bjørner’s domain modelling [20] in PL Scoping will fill this gap.

A characterization of the benefits and weakness perceived in the Domain Scoping and DRE phases using the agile method is presented in [21]. The observed variables were the stakeholders’ motivation, effort, communication and collaboration, iterative and adaptability aspects of the process, requirements and technological volatility. A question arisen from this study is: How the effort to perform SPL scoping is characterized by the stakeholders? The effort is measured in man-hours, and the answer was “great”, due to the huge amount of domain documentation (often incomplete and inconsistent) that has to be analysed to capture enough domain knowledge to provide acceptable asset scoping and product portfolio, and the lack of domain experts. Activities identified for the scoping phase were: Pre-scoping, Domain scoping, Product scoping, and Assets scoping. Bottlenecks found were: the absence of domain and product experts to capture products’ main functionalities, and the clear identification of features and their granularity. Moreover, variables stakeholders’ communication and collaboration, iterative and adaptability aspects of the process, were also found to affect the effort. Our research do not use an agile method, nevertheless we claim to reduce the scoping effort by introducing the Bjørner’s business process-centric technique of domain modelling [20], modified by introducing the quality intrinsics descriptor, to specify quality properties related to business processes functions at this very early stage.

A framework is described in [22] for SPL developments including the SPL scoping phase, to specify what the SPL can or cannot do, by defining those behaviours or aspects that will be incorporated or eliminated from the SPL. Scoping defines the long-term feasibility of the SPL; it starts with a broad document, which is being refined in the measure that more domain knowledge is captured. The goal is to establish a limit for the SPL, to achieve business and market goals. Our research aims to establish a “structure” for this document (input/output artefacts and their structure, techniques used, etc.), since a precise definition was not found in the literature; it will be used as a valid input to reduce the effort in the DRE and DD phases. Hence the scoping document will result an important asset.

The proposed framework proposed suggests the following activities for SPL scoping:

- Workshops and interviews with the stakeholders;
- Examine existing products (bottom-up approach [23]);
- Context diagrams;
- Develop a matrix of attributes/products
- Develop SPL scenarios

Where, a context diagram represents relevant entities related with the SPL w.r.t the users of the products; the attributes/products matrix is used to define the variability of
the SPL; the scenarios are used to identify interactions that are common to all products and those that are variants.

The Bjørner’s domain modelling [20] used in our Domain Scoping step is compliant with most of the above requirements, excepting for - Examine existing products, which is part of the Portfolio Scoping step, where a bottom-up approach will be used [12][23]; however, this point will not be treated here, being the object of an on-going work.

A specific method based on PuLSE [24], Pulse-Eco is presented. This process uses a DE bottom-up development process; we are actually focusing on a DE top-down [23] approach, combined with a bottom-up approach for the study of existing products [12], which is recommended in SPL scoping by the new standard [11]; this study however, can be performed on the basis of an “agile” bottom-up process [25].

In [26], three domain engineering approaches were compared, two of them related to SPL, namely, Pohl et al. [9] and the ISO/IEC standard [11], the other one the classic Bjørner’s DE approach [20], strongly based on business processes modelling. From this comparison, [20] was found suitable to integrates the Domain Scoping step of the ISO/IEC 26550 SPL Reference Model [11], and quality was included as a new facet; however, since quality is involved in all facets used in [20] to specify the domain model from different stakeholders’ viewpoints; in our present work quality is specified as an intrinsics facet descriptor and the whole approach is illustrated with a complete case study.

3. SPL Domain Engineering Guidelines with the New Standard ISO/IEC 26550

The complete DE lifecycle will be briefly described in what follows, according to the ISO/IEC 26550 guidelines [11]; however in this work, only the Domain Scoping step of the PL Scoping phase will be treated in details.

According to the SEI² definition [22][27][28], PL Scoping is itself a core asset. In SPL development, scoping is a fundamental activity that will determine the long-term viability of the SPL. Like scoping in general, PL Scoping determines what’s “in” and what’s “out” of the SPL. The scope definition identifies those entities with which products in the SPL will interact (that is, the product line context), and it also establishes the commonality and sets limits on the variability of the products in the SPL. The scope definition usually begins as a broad, general draft document that is refined as more knowledge is captured and more analysis is performed. For example, for a SPL for a Web-based system, browsers would definitely be “in”. Aircraft flight simulators instead, would definitely be “out”; the PL scope may not come into sharp focus all at once. The goal of the scope definition is to draw the boundary between “in” and “out” in such a way that the SPL satisfies its business and market goals.

Five phases are considered in ISO/IEC 26550; notice that phases and sub-phases can be performed in the order established by the company or organization requiring the SPL [11].

3.1 Product Line Scoping (PL Scoping)

It defines SPL boundaries for DE, envisioning major common and variable features to all products within the SPL. Economical aspects are analysed and the commercialization of the SPL product family is planned; PL Scoping is responsible of the whole SPL management and consequent evolution: it involves 3 sub-phases:

a) Product Portfolio Scoping: 1. Identify products that the SPL should be developing, producing, marketing and selling (product “roadmap”); 2. The study of common and variable feature of existing products should provide guidance to meet business objectives and face SPL evolution; 3. Schedule for introducing products to the market. It is input to Domain Scoping.

b) Domain Scoping: identify and bound functional or organizational areas that SPL will impact to provide sufficient reuse potential to justify the SPL creation.

c) Assets Scoping: identify the boundaries of core assets, providing a first glance at common and variable assets. It Identifies reusable assets and calculate the cost/benefit estimated from each asset in order to determine whether an organization should launch an SPL. Major outputs of PL Scoping are: the asset proposal; it includes major assets (functional areas and high-level common and variable features of all SPL products) that will be included in an SPL with their quantified costs and benefits estimation results. The features defined in the asset proposal directly affect Domain Requirements Engineering (DRE) and Application Requirements Engineering (ARE) shown in Figure 1. More than one asset proposal can be made to find out an optimal set of products and assets. The asset proposal defines also a schedule for delivering specific products to customers and for bringing them to market.

3.2 Domain Requirements Engineering (DRE)

It has to adhere to the specification of the SPL’s high-level features provided by PL Scoping. Based on these features, it creates detailed common and variable requirements sufficient to guide subsequent Domain Design (where the SPL RA is designed), realization and testing phases. It involves 5 sub-phases: - Domain requirements elicitation, - Domain requirements analysis, - Domain requirements specification, - Domain requirements validation, and - Domain Requirements Management (to handle changes in requirements).

3.3 Domain Design (DD)

It draws upon the specifications to develop an SPL architecture that enables the realization of the planned commonality and variability within the SPL. The main goal is to produce the RA, defining general SPL structure and textures. RA reflects additional internal variability introduced by technical solutions besides the external variability, i.e., commonality and variability in the user’s perceived requirements. It involves the sub-phases: - RA design, - RA evaluation (quality assurance technique), and - Domain Design Management (to handle changes in the RA design).
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3.4 Domain Realization/Implementation
Design and implementation of reusable loosely coupled software components and configurable interfaces, implementing common and variable artefacts offered by RA. Domain realization includes configuration mechanisms to realize variability domain implementation, such as building and buying components supporting the RA infrastructure. They are not yet executable applications.

3.5 Domain Testing/Validation
It validates the domain artefacts created in previous phases and generates domain test artefacts that can be reused later on in Application Testing. Testing in this context means review, validation and verification of artefacts as well as eventually testing some available implementations.

In this work, only the Domain Scoping sub-phase, within the PL Scoping phase will be applied to a case study, to illustrate our approach.

4. The PL Scoping Process: PLScOp
The adaptation of the ISO/IEC 26550 PL Scoping phase is constituted by the PLScop process that is outlined in what follows:

4.1 PLScop Context
The PL Scoping guidelines of the ISO/IEC 26550 standard were completed by integrating to the Domain Scoping sub-phase, the stages described by Bjørner [20] for classic DE for single software systems, not considered for an SPL context. However, they provide a nice technique to specify domain knowledge, based on facets and stakeholders’ viewpoints [26].

A facet is defined in [20] as a finite set of generic forms of describing a domain from different stakeholders’ perspectives or viewpoints, namely, business processes, support technology, management & organization, rules & regulations, human behaviour, and intrinsics; their complete definitions were presented in [26].

The facet notion is not new in Software Engineering [29]; according to [20], each facet represents a view of the domain from different perspectives; the union of these views conforms the complete domain view, called Domain Model; moreover, the special intrinsics facet is a facet containing descriptors or attributes (entity, function, event, behaviour) necessary to describe all the other facets (see Table 1); the intrinsics notion has allowed us to include software quality, specified by the ISO/IEC 25010 standard [13], as a new intrinsic descriptor. Software quality is then considered to specify all other facets.

Table 1: Intrinsics to Describe All Domain Facets with the New Quality Descriptor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsics descriptors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entities</td>
<td>Represent the phenomena and concepts of the domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Operations (actions) performed on the entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Imply changes in entities by function invocations, i.e., actions in the domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Sequences of actions and events affecting domain entities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, this work involves Business Processes, Support Technology, and Rules & Regulations facets, since the final aim of DE is to build an SPL reference architecture; Management & Organization and Human Behaviour facets can be also described in terms of quality, using models, such as CMMI³ where organizational practices are deeply involved, but this topic is outside the scope of the present work.

Notice that in the Domain Scoping adaptation from [11] integrating Bjørner’s domain development [20], a huge number of business processes can be derived from the so-called Domain Description Units (DDU) specifications from the declarations of different stakeholders groups expressing their viewpoints. However, this complete specification is outside the PL Scoping spirit, which aims to offer a quick “glance” of the SPL feasibility and limitations, hence only the presentation of few basic modelling elements are considered sufficient to illustrate the “How to do” of our process.

4.2 PLScop
The adaptation of the ISO/IEC 26550 PL Scoping guidelines, is presented in what follows; notice that Asset Scoping and Portfolio Scoping are left as the last steps, since according to [11], the order in which they are executed depends on the organization building the SPL, and we have major interest here in Domain Scoping; however, if a study of existing market products for the domain has to be done, Product Portfolio Scoping should be executed first to perform this study, and its output should be input to the Domain Scoping step.

4.2.1 PLScop process

1. Domain Scoping:
   Input: Domain informal documentation provided by the organization requiring the SPL, Domain Quality Model (DQM) specified by ISO/IEC 25010 [13].
   a) Stakeholders identification:
      Input: visits, interviews, workshops, questionnaires (specific techniques for each one of these activities should be specified).
      • Identify groups of stakeholders with similar interests in the organization requiring the SPL.  
   Output: list of stakeholders’ groups type: text
   b) Domain acquisition:
      Input: List of Stakeholders’ groups
      • Capture and gather information from stakeholders into declarations to build Domain Description Units (DDU) for each stakeholder viewpoint;
   Output: DDU type: table
   c) Domain analysis:
      Input: DDU

³ Capability Maturity Model Integration
Analyse DDU, study possible inconsistencies, and business processes are extracted first from DDU [20],
to specify the Business Processes facet from a
stakeholder viewpoint relevant to the domain; it is
represented by a table, UML [30] and BPMN
diagrams, using intrinsics facet descriptors.
Quality issues are included as a new intrinsic facet
descriptor.

Then other facets, relevant to the domain, are also
specified according to domain specific stakeholders’
viewpoints; for example, in our case they will be
Support Technology from the Domain Engineers
viewpoint, and Rules & Regulations from the Directors
of healthcare governmental institutions viewpoint.
The business processes extracted from the DDUs for
these stakeholders’ viewpoints are identified among
the behaviours present in the facets, and specified as
new Business Processes facets, considering the
respective stakeholders’ viewpoint.
Output: Facets specifications type: table; UML and
BPMN diagrams for business processes
d) Domain Modelling:
Input: Facets specifications
A domain description is obtained from all the facets
specifications by intrinsics; this document should be
focused on commonality and variability of the entities
involved. According to [20] a domain model is a
meaningful domain description; it will be represented
integrating the BPMN specifications for all business
processes considered.
Output: Domain Model type: BPMN. To have a more
general specification of the domain model, including all
facets, an ontological approach could be considered.

2. Asset Scoping
Input Domain Model specification
Information on core assets will be extracted from domain
model to conform the SPL Core Asset Repository, which
will be informally described into the Asset Proposal
document, analysing here also economical factors for the
SPL feasibility.
Output: Asset Proposal document

3. Product Portfolio Scoping
Input: Available documentation on existing products
Existing products in the domain are assumed to exist; they
will be studied to infer about the SPL products that can be
developed, main capabilities and limitations; this study
could be preformed applying an extractive or bottom-up
process to construct automatically a draft candidate
architecture [31] using reengineering techniques to handle
similarity analysis of the products’ components [12]. Notice
that since in general widely used products on the market are
considered, results of the existing products study are
included into the market study on the SPL feasibility.
Output: Product Roadmap type: table, graph, UML diagram

Notice that from the Product Roadmap artefact, the candidate
architecture artefact is a first broad draft of the RA that can be
built [12]. This possibility should be considered, to have also
an additional input to the DRE phase, thus reducing the
required effort there. This initial candidate architecture has
imbeded the domain knowledge, extracted from existing
products about main common and variant components, which
can be enriched with the more general information from the
Domain Model. It will become also part of the Asset Proposal.

4.3 PLScop: Advantages and Limitations
If a first candidate architecture can be constructed or is
available for a domain, our PLScop, and in particular the
Portfolio Scoping step, can be transformed into a process to
perform the RA evolution, i.e., management of changes, in
DRE and DD phases. The analysis of existing products is not
an easy task, and it depends much on the available market
products documentation, requiring a considerable effort to
apply reengineering techniques [12]. If this draft architecture is
not available, the Domain Scoping step of our PLScop is still
crucial to construct a detailed Domain Model that will help to
delimit clearly the SPL scope and functional and non
functional granularity, to reduce the effort in the subsequent
DE phases where the RA is built.

The advantage of our process is to have combined top-down
and bottom-up approaches to specify the domain: top-down is
considered in the philosophical Björner’s approach [20], which
starts with the domain decomposition into organizational
business processes specified by intrinsics descriptors, and it is
generally used in SPL [9][11]. The bottom-up approach is
proposed to be used in the Portfolio Scoping step also in
[9][11], to have a broad picture of the SPL present and future
products, by studying domain existing products in the
organization proposing the SPL or in different organizations
with similar domains. In this sense, our proposition takes
advantages from the combination of [9] and [11], reducing
general weaknesses of DE lifecycle.

5. Application to the Healthcare Information Systems
Domain
In what follows, the Healthcare Information Systems (HIS)
Domain for the SPL will be briefly discussed to be applied to
illustrate PLScop.

5.1 SPL Domain: Healthcare Information Systems (HIS)
HIS [32] are software intensive systems, i.e., complex
integrated information systems, generally located in different
and distant institutions and with mandatory (priority) NFR,
such as interoperability, availability and security.
Interoperability (technical), the HIS crucial quality property
for Electronic Health Records (EHR) management and
sharing, is the ability of two or more systems or components
to exchange information and to use the exchanged information;
semantic interoperability refers to use a common terminology
language to communicate systems; process interoperability
incorporates business processes and healthcare professionals
must standardise business rules to ensure that health
information is properly recorded, such as the transfer of
information between systems is consistent and complete [33].
The general architecture is a hybrid event-based style,
SOA/Layers [12][31], see Figure 2 (from Wikipedia). HIS
must facilitate transparent sharing of different kinds of medical
information such as EHR and laboratory imaging results,
offering also telemedicine services that can be performed
online at remote locations, with wide support of information
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technology. The use of standards such as HL7, HL7 CDA, LOINC\(^\text{a}\), and DICOM\(^\text{b}\) are mandatory for interoperability of EHR and laboratory & imaging results [32][33][25][34]. Nevertheless, in actual medical practice, SPL for HIS have not yet been completely defined, developed and adopted; the lack of agreement on medical standards and psychosocial issues makes difficult the interoperability of EHR, and HIS general adoption is still difficult, even if specific laws and regulations towards these goals have been promulgated worldwide.

5.2 Software Quality Modelling in SPL Domain Scoping

Quality has been defined in general as a level of excellence, conformance with specifications, requirements satisfaction, defect free, accomplishment of customer demands [35], and also related to human aspects such as usability and satisfaction [36]. The early specification in PL Scoping of software quality will facilitate to map this quality into all subsequent DE activities; this information on domain quality will be specified as a Quality Model (DQM), reflected into the Domain Model, and registered in the Asset Core Repository. As we have already pointed out, quality assurance is crucial in an industrial software production context to guarantee SPL evolution and the massive assets reuse, impacting on the quality of all products of the SPL family [37].

![Figure 2: Hybrid Architecture SOA/Layers](image)

The ISO/IEC 25010 Quality Model standard [13] to specify software product quality is part of the SQuaRE series of standards of the International Standards Organization (ISO). This series focuses on quality, requirements and evaluation of software products. It states compatibility with other ISO standards on quality measures and process quality [38]. The central document of the series is the known ISO/IEC 25010 Quality Model [13], describing a hierarchical framework where quality is decomposed into levels of characteristics, sub-characteristics, etc., until the attributes or measurable elements. The Product Quality Model will be used here, since we are in a software development context; Figure 3 [25][32], shows its adaptation to specify the HIS domain quality w.r.t. the SPL family of software products.

![Figure 3: ISO/IEC 25010 HIS Domain Quality Model (HIS-DQM)](image)

5.3 Case Study Scope

For this work, the HIS domain for the SPL is restricted to its basic functionalities (EHR-HIS), namely EHR management, patient attention with patient appointment scheduling and capture of demographic data, emission of medical reports, basic administrative services for patient attention; imaging and laboratory services, hospital rooms management, nursing services, urgencies, general hospital administration, etc. will not be considered here [25][34]. Note that the example has been simplified, since only HIS elements at a high granularity level have been treated, avoiding low-level details to facilitate the illustration of our approach, following also the spirit of the PL Scoping phase.

On the other hand, the main facets that will be specified in this work are Business Processes, Support Technology, and Rules&Regulations. The viewpoints considered are: Doctors’ group for Business Processes, Domain Engineers’ group for Support Technology, and Directors of healthcare governmental institutions for Rules&Regulations. Facets, stakeholders’ groups, and viewpoints were selected on the bases of the SPL DE development process, whose main goal is to design a Reference Architecture.

5.4 Application of PLScop to the HIS Case Study

Following the basic steps defined in the Domain Scoping sub-phase, we have:

a) Stakeholders Identification: The technique used consists in doing the expertise of domain engineer extracted from visits, interviews, workshops or questionnaires. Different viewpoints are identified to conform the stakeholders’ groups: Doctors, Domain Engineers and Directors of Healthcare governmental institutions.

b) Domain Acquisition: The technique used consists in statements or Declarations formulated by stakeholders to illustrate their viewpoints.

---

\(^a\) Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes  
\(^b\) Digital Communication in Medicine
DDU construction:
The declarator and forms are grouped in the Domain Description Unit (DDU) and are represented as tables (see Tables II, III, and IV) for each one of the identified stakeholders' groups.

Table II: DDU for EHR-HIS Domain from the Doctors’ Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Group: Doctors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient is attended in hospital under scheduled appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it is the patient first appointment, a new EHR must be created by nurse, else nurse retrieves patient existing EHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient EHR is accessed by doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New exams and laboratory results can be added to patient EHR by doctor, if it is the case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and medical orders for patient are produced by doctor to conclude medical attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new appointment is scheduled by nurse if required by Doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical equipment and material can be required by doctor to provide adequate medical attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III: DDU for EHR-HIS Domain from the Domain Engineers’ Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Group: Domain Engineers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHR is supported by an hybrid architecture SOA/Layers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIS architectural style supports mainly modifiability, interoperability, performance (time-behaviour), and security services are provided by Internet protocols, crosscutting all layers; availability however depends on internet connection;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission Layer is managed by a Web Server that communicates all other layers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients access HIS by a browser in Presentation Layer, which connects to the Transmission Layer via a Web Server</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical units should have wide range internet and intranet access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main EHR-HIS functionalities must be supported; patient appointment services, EHR management and emission of medical reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV: DDU for EHR-HIS Domain from Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions’ Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Group: Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHR-HIS Domain Description Unit</td>
<td>Declarations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitalize EHR with standard format to achieve sharing among doctors and national and international healthcare institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Database of national and international specialists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Web platform to manage on-line appointment services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Domain Analysis: The technique used consists in the initial domain knowledge is captured from the DDUs (see Table II, III and IV, and described textually in Table III as business processes.

Facets specification:
In Table V, business processes specific to the Business Processes facet are derived first [20] from DDU, considering the Doctors’ viewpoint. Tables VI and VII will specify business processes specific to facets Support Technology and Rules & Regulations, respectively; only one process will be specified for each stakeholder’s group viewpoint to abridge this presentation.

Table V: Business Process Derived from the DDU of Doctors’ Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Group: Doctors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment Services</td>
<td>From the arrival of a patient to hospital to attend a scheduled appointment, check or create new patient EHR including capture of demographic data and general patient information by nurse; EHR management, medical consultation, diagnosis, emission of medical order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI: Business Process Derived from the DDU of Domain Engineers’ Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Group: Domain Engineers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHR Management</td>
<td>Consider in the User Interface (UI) component in Presentation Layer, the access to the EHR Management system in Process Layer; provide EHR access, modification, sharing and registering in database in Data Layer. A Transmission Layers should be present for network services, and it crosscuts all other layers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII: Business Process Derived from the DD of Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions’ Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Stakeholders’ Group: Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-line appointment services</td>
<td>Provide precise appointment services with specific specialist; handle requests’ volume, provide secure access to appointment services; have wide-range and reliable connection facility; have a friendly user interface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different notations can be used to specify facets from stakeholders’ viewpoints with intrinsics descriptors, each one offering different specification granularity; from each specification, more details are extracted; in this work the following notations will be used:

- informal textual specification by tables (see Tables VIII, X, and XI),
- semi-formal UML [30] diagrams (see Figure 4, 6, and 7) for all facets,
- semi-formal BPMN [14] diagrams for business processes in the Business Process facet (see Figure 5 [39]).

In this context, a semi-formal notation language means that it has well-defined syntax and semantics; however it cannot be verified mathematically. Formal languages, such as VDM, Z, B, and RAISE/RSL, also mentioned in [20], are used to specify high assurance systems, to reduce errors in requirement definitions of safety-critical software systems. The HIS domain is basically constituted by non-safety-critical integrated enterprise systems, hence we choose UML and BPMN standard notations, widely used by the software community in this domain.
Facet equipment, modifiability by doctor; Functions R, is scheduled. Process F to access Business Process R: EH, tests medical materials calling line connection to access doctor produces EHR. Quality to time (the abridged behaviour name is specified within () in italics). Emission of the EHR persistency—quick requires special EHR Business Process, of material, HIS requiring the SPL. R is reviewed, modified registered. H, performs diagnosis in (Request of on-line hand-outs). EHR can consult on-line with other doctors in different healthcare institutions or locally to perform diagnosis; diagnosis is provided and registered on EHR. Doctor requests medical materials calling authorized staff (or using the EHR-HIS system if this facility is available) (Request of medical material). Doctor requests medical equipment calling authorized staff (or using the EHR-HIS system if this facility is available) (Request of medical equipment). Time behaviour and availability of on-line connection to access EHR, time behaviour to access EHR, modifiability to change EHR located in ways supported to retrieve always EHR, and interoperability for EHR sharing. Medical hand-outs or catalogues are required on-line; on line consultation with other doctors in different healthcare institutions or locally to perform diagnosis; diagnosis is provided and registered on EHR. Doctor requests on-line hand-outs or catalogues; he can consult on-line with other doctors in different healthcare institutions or local doctors, and patient’s EHR must be shared by other doctors; review laboratory and/or examinations results; doctor produces diagnosis (Request of on-line hand-outs).

Resources: Medical Materials (*) Medical materials request. Doctor requires medical material for consultation. Doctor requests medical materials calling authorized staff (or using the EHR-HIS system if this facility is available) (Request of medical material). Medical equipment request. Doctor requires special equipment for diagnosis. Doctor requests medical equipment calling authorized staff (or using the EHR-HIS system if this facility is available) (Request of medical equipment).

Medical Appointment Emission of new appointment. New appointment is required for patient, if necessary; appointment is scheduled. Doctor registers patient for a new appointment; the appointment is scheduled. (Request/schedule new appoint.) Availability of on-line connection to access EHR for Medical Appointment.

Medical Order Emission of medical order. Medical order is elaborated for present consultation. Doctor emits medical order (Emit/register medical order). Availability of on-line connection to access EHR to emit and register Medical Order.

(*) These services will not be considered for EHR-HIS in this work; the abridged behaviour name is specified within ( ) in italics.
Figure 5: Appointment Services Process from Doctors’ Viewpoint Specified from the Intrinsics Facet, Expressed in BPMN
Table IX: BPMN Notation Used in the Business Process Facet Specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPMN Notation</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Interpretation (for Figure 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Simple or atomic activity representing the work in an organization. They consume resources; it is not detailed further.</td>
<td>They can be mapped into SPL RA architectural components or services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive gate</td>
<td>Control element of data workflow. A unique path is selected among several alternatives</td>
<td>It represents the SPL variability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive gate</td>
<td>Control element of the data workflow. One or more path(s) can be selected from several alternatives</td>
<td>It represents the SPL variability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting event</td>
<td>It initiates a process</td>
<td>It represents the starting or entry point of a business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting message event</td>
<td>A process initiates when a message is received</td>
<td>It represents the events arising from an active business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending event</td>
<td>It indicates the end of a workflow</td>
<td>It represents the end of some behaviour in the business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal ending event</td>
<td>It indicates that a process ends, even if there are active workflows</td>
<td>It represents the end of a business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate link event</td>
<td>It allows the connection of two process sections.</td>
<td>It allows a connection between two sections of the business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimlanes (Pool)</td>
<td>It is a process container; it represents participant, entity or role.</td>
<td>It represents the stakeholders’ viewpoints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimlanes (Lane)</td>
<td>They are pool’s subdivisions; it represents participants within an organization.</td>
<td>It represents the different behaviours of the business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector object: Sequence</td>
<td>It represents the workflow and the sequence of activities.</td>
<td>It represents the execution flow of the activities in a business process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector object: Message</td>
<td>It represents interactions among processes or pools.</td>
<td>It represents changes of stakeholders’ viewpoints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>They are used to relate additional information on the process.</td>
<td>They relate entities, activities or functions with required quality properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefact: data object</td>
<td>They provide additional information on the process; they show the information required by an activity, such as input/output.</td>
<td>Document specifying the quality required by entities, activities or functions, in each behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other business processes can be derived from the analysis of the other facets, such as the on-line appointment services process (see Table VI) from the DDU representing the viewpoint of Directors of healthcare governmental institutions, or the construction of EHR management system (see Table VII) process from the DDU representing the viewpoint of Domain Engineers; however, they will not be considered for this study to abridge the presentation.

Table IX describes the BPMN symbols used in the Appointment Services Process from Doctors’ Viewpoint, specified from the intrinsics facet. A glimpse on SPL variability can be inferred from the inclusive and exclusive logic gates, since they reflect alternative workflows; they imply a sequence of actions to be performed to achieve a functionality, i.e. functional variability; however, since each activity has associated its quality property, this also can imply non functional variability. This point has to be signalled, because in the domain modelling by the intrinsic descriptors, which was represented in UML (see Figure 4), variability cannot be shown.

In consequence, the use of BPMN is advantageous for our approach, because it contributes to show variability at business process level, which will be mapped later-on into the SPL RA variability model.
### Table X: Textual Specification by Intrinsic of Domain Engineers’ Viewpoint for the Support Technology Facet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>EHR-HIS – Healthcare institution requiring the SPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ Group: Domain Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Technology Facet</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Layer: User Interface (UI)</td>
<td>HIS on-line access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Layer</strong>: EHR-HIS functionalities</td>
<td>Patient System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EHR Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Layer: Database</td>
<td>Data Base Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission or communication Layer: Network</td>
<td>Internet Communication protocols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 6: UML Specification by Intrinsic of Domain Engineers’ Viewpoint for the Support Technology Facet](image-url)
Table XI: Textual Specification by Intrinsics of Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions’ Viewpoint for the Rules & Regulations Facet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Entities</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHR-HIS – Healthcare institution requiring the SPL</td>
<td>Healthcare records are digitalized using some standard format</td>
<td>Healthcare records are shared (EHR sharing)</td>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ Group: Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions</td>
<td>Database of specialists</td>
<td>Data Base Management System</td>
<td>Provide all data base services; Retrieve, record, modify specialist data</td>
<td>Interoperability, adaptability-scalability, availability-persistency, security (integrity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Regulations Facet</td>
<td>Appointment scheduling service</td>
<td>Appointment is assigned or kept in a waiting list; appointment is reported to patient; priority is managed</td>
<td>Provide precise appointment services with specialist; handle volume of requests, provide secure access to appointment services; have available connection facility; have a friendly user interface (Provide on-line appoint. services)</td>
<td>Adaptability-scalability, availability-persistency, security, usability, precision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: UML Specification by Intrinsics of Directors of Healthcare Governmental Institutions’ Viewpoint for the Rules & Regulations Facet

**d) Domain Modelling**: The technique used consists in the facet specifications with the intrinsics, by tables and UML diagrams, obtained in step (c) (see Tables VIII, X and XI, and Figures 4, 6, 7). Notice that we have only the Appointment Services Business Process facet, which is specified in BPMN in Figure 5, and it is an example of a Domain Model. However, to have the complete Domain Model picture, the other business processes derived from DDUs in Tables VI and VII, EHR management, from the Domain Engineer viewpoint and On-line appointment services, from the Directors of healthcare governmental institutions viewpoint respectively, are found as behaviours in the corresponding facet specification (see Table X and XI), and they can be specified by intrinsics as new Business Process facets, as it was done for Appointment Services in Table VIII. From the business process facet analysis, see Table VIII and Figures 4 and 5, and from the BPMN specifications, we obtain information on:

- The clear identification of the involved stakeholders.
- Possible SPL variants from a particular viewpoint, such as the security quality property (see Figure 5), which can be solved proposing later on different available technological mechanisms or services. Note that quality properties are reflected in all viewpoints specifications due to the intrinsic quality descriptor that has been introduced in the adaptation of the domain modelling approach proposed in [20].
- Fine-grained functionalities present in the process as “functions” that can be mapped into large-grained architectural components or services with the BPMN “Aggregation” construct.
- Quality that must be satisfied by each functionality present in the process is specified as a comment, since BPMN has no notation for quality properties.
- The entities or objects produced or manipulated from/by functionalities.
6. CONCLUSION

It is known that general frameworks explain the “What to do” about things, but not the “How to do” to make things work. We presents the Domain Scoping phase within the DE lifecycle, following the SPL Reference Model ISO/IEC 26550. The “How to do” is taken from Bjørner’s domain modelling, which involves the facet notion and the stakeholders’ viewpoint, focusing on business process modelling. Our main contribution is the specification of the Domain Scoping step as a systematic and repeatable process, centered on the early specification of quality properties as descriptors involved in all facets, considering their clear traceability, reflected into the BPMN representation; this issue will facilitate later on the reference architecture evolution. Notice also that the derivation of the business process specification in BPMN can be automatized from the UML representation of the facets; it is also a widely known and used notation, to bridge the gap between business processes and their implementation, for example as Web services [14]. It is claimed that the effort spent in PL Scoping will reduce the huge effort required in DRE and DD phases [21]. The Domain Scoping step of our PLScoP is crucial to construct a detailed Domain Model that will help to delimit clearly the SPL scope and functional and non functional granularity, to reduce the effort in the subsequent DRE and DD phases, where the RA is built. Our Domain Scoping process is applied to a complete case study in the Healthcare Information System domain to illustrate our approach. A more complete specification of PLScoP, and subsequent DRE and DD phases of the DE lifecycle to construct the SPL RA, are on-going works.
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