ABSTRACT. Non-functional requirements (NFRs) are being addressed by the architecture. NFRs are not focused properly as functional requirements (FRs) are dealt and focused. FRs are being taken under consideration at the early stage of software process development (such as architectural level). Usually, the NFRs are being focused at the end of the project, which does not fulfill the desired qualities. Early design decision is very important to achieve a strong connection between design and requirements, quality of a system and a consistent software product. Architecture and NFRs constraint each other therefore, they should be treated together. Runtime NFRs (such as performance, security and fault tolerance) and some of those which are non-runtime (such as maintainability) should be considered at the architectural level. This paper presents a survey that emphasizes the integration of NFRs and architectural. We have analyzed the reported techniques on the basis of our evaluation criteria and have presented a comparison.
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1. Introduction. Architecture is the high level design of a system. It is started after immediately the requirements phase. NFRs are the abstract requirements of a system that is to be built. Non-functional requirements are often called a system features. Other terms for non-functional requirements are "constraints", "quality attributes", "quality goals", "quality of service requirements" and "non-behavioral requirements". NFRs are rarely taken under consideration in most of the software development processes. They are rarely considered due to their very high abstraction level, less support of tool and languages, complexity, and informality. In the software engineering, a tight relationship nonfunctional requirement (NFRs) and software architectures (SAS) exists between. NFRs have high abstraction level because they cannot be expressed quantitatively, such as performance, fault tolerance, availability, maintainability, etc. We can’t write a test case to verify a system’s “reliability or the absence of security vulnerabilities.” Non-functional requirements are proved to be the reason of most modern applications failure. Functional requirements are being incorporated into software architecture at early stages of process, at the end of process all of them are implemented to satisfy the requirements defined at early stages. Most of the methods, techniques, languages and tools are introduced to capture the functional requirements. NFRs are not taken into account at the early stage of the software development process that affects the system qualities. More over Non-functional requirements are proved to be the reason of most modern applications failure. The continuing stream of business system disasters being reported in the press are rarely the result of a functional defect. Early design decision is required to strengthen the connection between requirements and design. Examples of design decisions are the decisions such as “we shall separate user interface from the rest of the application to make both interface and application itself more easily modifiable” Non-functional requirements affect different activities and roles related to the software development process. One of the strongest links is with software architecture, especially architectural decision-making: NFRs often influence the system architecture more than functional requirements do. For instance, Zhu and Gorton state that “the rationale behind each
architecture decision is mostly about achieving certain NFRs" [15] Chung and Leite claim that “[NFRs] play a critical role during system development, serving as selection criteria for choosing among myriads of alternative designs and ultimate implementations’”[16] and Ozkaya et al. say that “business goals and their associated quality attribute requirements strongly influence a system’s architecture”[17].

Architecture addresses the characteristics of the system. The architectural decision taken for an application affects the NFRs. If performance is critical issue, we need to localize critical operations within a small number of subsystems with minimized inter communication. If security is demanded, we need to use a layered architecture. Similarly, if safety is important, we need to deploy small number of subsystems. If the focus of the application is on the maintainability, we need to use fine-grain, self-contained and replaceable components. NFRs cannot be evaluated without looking at the system as a whole because NFRs are described as attributes of the system that contributes to the overall quality of the product. This is the evident of the fact that the NFRs are very complex. On the other hand it is also evident that non-functional requirements are also very important since they contribute to the overall quality of the resulting system [11][19].

Nowadays it is demanded to careful capture and models the requirements and architectural design in the early stage of the software development process. It is due to the increasing size, complexity, distribution and heterogeneity [6]. Achieving the quality of the product is very important. Various attributes are generally considered important for obtaining a software design of good quality-various “illities” (maintainability, portability, testability, and traceability), various nesses (correctness, robustness)[19]. An interesting distinction is the one between quality attributes at run-time (performance, security, availability, functionality, usability), those not at run-time (modifiability, portability, reusability, integrability and testability) and those related to the architecture’s intrinsic qualities (conceptual integrity, correctness, completeness and build ability) [12]. FRs, NFRs must be realized through the architecture [4][8]. Furthermore NFRs is an Important step to close the gap between requirement engineering and Software engineering [24-28].

Non-functional requirements compete and conflict each other (such as maintainability and performance). Using large-grain components improves performance but reduces maintainability. Similarly, introducing redundant data improves availability but makes security more difficult. If both performance and maintainability is required, we need a compromised solution. For example to compromise with availability, we need to sacrifice in rush hours and include some down time. A tradeoff is needed to involve finding an optimal solution. The development of large software systems is the need of almost every organization. Because of the involvement of the non-functional requirements, software architecture design has become an important step in large software development [10].

This paper presents a survey that emphasizes the integration of NFRs and architectural. Architecture and NFRs constraint each other therefore, they should be treated together. The survey is made on the bases of certain evaluation criteria. This evaluation criteria is defined in the parameters shape. The rest of the paper is as follow: Section 2 discusses the existing techniques of integrating the NFRs and architecture in detail. In section 3 we introduce the evaluation criteria through which we analyze the existing techniques of integrating the NFRs and architecture. A thorough analysis of the existing techniques is presented in section 4. Finally, section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Techniques for Integrating Non-functional Requirements and Architecture. Software architecture is the first step after the requirements elicitation of software development process. The basic purpose of the architecture is to ensure the productivity of the functional requirements (FRs) at the end of the product. The non-functional requirements (NFRs) are usually focused at the end of the product due to which the qualities of the system are affected. A number of techniques are reported to deal both the FRs and NFRs together in order to achieve the functionalities and qualities at the end of the product. The focus of technique may vary from each other, for example one technique may provide some practical solution, whereas another technique may only argue the issue or provide a framework or an approach to cater the issue of integration. Furthermore all the techniques may not applicable to cater all the NFRs (such as ‘illities’, nesses, those at runtime and those not at runtime). In order to get an insight into the existing literature on the issue of integrating architecture and non-functional requirements (NFRs), we carried out a thorough survey and critical analyses of relating software architecture and non-functional requirements techniques as discussed below in the following section.

2.1. Incorporating Non-Functional Requirements into Software Architectures. Nelson et al [1] presented an approach in which transactional and non-functional requirements (NFRs) are formally incorporated into dynamic software architecture. An appointment system is also proposed in order to demonstrate how this approach can be utilized in a real application. Furthermore, three NFRs properties have been chosen to focus
which are safety, availability and performance.

2.2 Use-Case And Scenario-Based Approach To Represent NFRs And Architectural Policies. C Lopes and H Astudillo [2] present a use case-based approach to describe NFRs. The approach is based on the concepts of architectural policies. This approach is used to employ use cases and scenarios to describe non-functional requirements, relate them to specific functional use case features, and serve as input to the architecture elaboration process.

2.3 A Framework For Building Non-Functional Software Architecture. Nelson et al [3] propose a Parmenides framework that defines how to deal with NFRs within the software development process. The framework describes the NFRs, their refinement, mapping into actual implementation, and integration with functional requirements (FRs). The framework defines precisely how NFRs are expressed and integrated into an architectural-based development. Furthermore, it defines two methodologies for describing NFRs, an integration strategy, a set of refinement rules and a mapping strategy[29-33].

2.4 Functional Requirements, Non-Functional Requirements and Architecture Should not be Separated. The position which is put forward by the Barbara et al [4] in this paper is that FRs, NFRs and architecture must be focused together, because they constraint each other. In addition, the architecture addresses the NFRs in the early stage of design. It is also well known that both FRs and NFRs must be realized through the architecture. In this paper authors argue that FRs, NFRs and architectural design must be developed in a tightly integrated approach. The authors motivate their approach with an example in this paper.

2.5 From Requirements To Architectural Design Using Goals And Scenarios. Eric Yu [5] proposed GRL (Goal Oriented Requirement Language) in this paper. GRL is a language for supporting goal and agent oriented modeling and reasoning of requirements, especially for dealing with NFRs. A UCM (a scenario oriented architectural notation) is also presented in this paper. Goals are used in the refinement of non-functional (NFRs) and functional requirements (FRs), exploring alternatives, their operationalization into architectural constructs.

2.6 Reconciling Software Requirements And Architecture: The CBSP Approach. Paul et al [6] propose an approach known as CBSP (Component, Bus, System and Property. The aim is to reconcile software requirement and architecture. Furthermore, CBSP minimize the gap between high level requirement and architectural descriptions. CBSP also allows identifying and isolating 'ilities' for the purpose of improving non-functional properties and allows capturing and maintaining arbitrarily complex relationship between requirement and architectural artifacts.

2.7 A Framework For the integration of functional and non-functional analyses of software architectures. Cortellessa et al [7] have proposed a framework to support the integration of functional and non-functional analyses of software system at architectural level. The proposed framework lies on an XML-based integration core and semantics relation between the models are represented. The scope of the paper is limited to the integration of two methodologies, the XML model and semantic rules.

2.8 An Experience-Based Approach For Integrating Architecture and Requirements Engineering. Barbara et al [8] argued that the process of integrating FRs, NFRs and architectural options (AO) should be fundamentally based on experience. The authors have presented a comprehensive approach to convert the major issues related to the FRs and NFRs and AOs. The proposed approach supports the elicitation, specification and design activity.

2.9 Towards Improved Traceabilityof Non-Functional Requirements. Cleland-Huang put forward the position of tracing the NFRs. He also explains the challenge of traceability is due to the interdependencies between NFRs and architecture. Three critical areas of traceability are identified by the author first, then existing techniques are evaluated and finally a holistic approach is proposed through different ways.

2.10 From Requirements To Architecture: The State Of Art In Software Architecture Design. In this paper Lin Liao presents a thorough overview of the methodologies that are using currently on software architecture design. It also focuses on the involvement of non-functional requirements with architecture.

3. Evaluation Criteria For Existing Techniques. In order to analyze and evaluate the existing trend of the integration of NFRs and architecture, we need some evaluation criteria. We have defined the evaluation criteria presented in table 1 for comparing the techniques. We suggest the evaluation criteria described in table 1 on the basis of thoroughly analyzing the existing approaches. The evaluation criteria selected relate almost all the approaches up to some extent. The evaluation criteria and their possible values are mentioned below in detail. The possible values that are possessed by the evaluation criteria are assigned to the corresponding techniques after the thorough analyses of the existing techniques. Moreover, the analyses evaluate the
strengths and weaknesses of various techniques and provide a concise review of the related literature based on the criteria presented in table 1. We propose the reported techniques below.

3.1 Quality Attributes. Quality attributes conflict each other. Therefore, all the quality attributes cannot be focused at the same time. For example, we improve performance, the maintainability is decreased. It is important to know the quality attributes are focused by the techniques. It has possible two values Yes or No.

3.2 Framework. Framework is nothing than a number a blocks and organizing them in order to depict a specific scenario and idea to cater for the problem. The organization of blocks is to tackle the issue of integrating the NFRs and architecture. It describes the name of framework.

3.3 Approach. A way of dealing with non-functional requirements is proposed by techniques that describe the approach of the techniques to tackle the issue of integrating the NFRs and architecture. It describes the name of framework.

3.4 Case Study. The proposed approach is either verified through an application or not is focused by this evaluation criterion. Here we mention the case study or ‘No’, if not implemented.

3.5 Notation. In this evaluation criterion we focus on the approach proposed by technique, using language or some notation to argue their approach. It either names the language (or notation) or states No.

3.6 Methodology. It describes the method, which has been adapted by the technique to illustrate the proposed approach. The values either name the method or No.

3.7 Tools. This criterion tells the use of tool described in the techniques or not. It has possible two values, Yes if used, No if not used. This criterion is very important because through this we can find out the use of tools in the description of the non-functional requirements [34-36].

The evaluation criteria discussed above are listed in a table 1 to illustrate thoroughly in order to comprehend the discussion based on these criteria. We have focused seven parameters to evaluate, because these are the factors that are discussed almost in all the techniques that are surveyed.

4. Analysis and Discussion. Table 2 presents the comparison of the above techniques based on the evaluation criteria described in table 1. In the first row of the table we have given the parameters used as evaluation criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>POSSIBLE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Quality Attribute(S)</td>
<td>Specific Quality Attributes, are Focused</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>The Proposed Framework</td>
<td>Name of Framework, N/A (If Not Used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>The Proposed Approach</td>
<td>Name of Approach N/A (If Not Used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>A Practical Example, Which Is Taken Into Account To Describe The Proposed Approach</td>
<td>System/Application Name Which is Implemented, N/A (If not Implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Notation</td>
<td>The Proposed Approach Used Notation Or Not</td>
<td>Name Of Notation, N/A (If Not Used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>The Method Of Presenting The Proposed Approach</td>
<td>Name Of Method, N/A (If Argued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>The Tool Used In Proposed Idea</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above comparison we conclude that some of the quality attributes could be focused at architectural level because the quality attributes compete and conflict each other. Nelson et al [1] [3] focus the runtime quality attributes to achieve the applicability. The applicability of the integration of software architecture and nfrs is evident from the comparison. Similarly, only nelson et al [1] [3] [37] propose a
specific framework. After analyzing the reported techniques we also conclude that, almost all the techniques practically implemented their proposed approach through a case study. It means the integration of nfrs and architecture is applicable to practical application. This comparison of the existing approaches shows that nfrs have very less support of notations. There is no specific notation for non-functional requirements. Therefore, only block diagram and use case diagram could describe this issue up to some extent [23] [38]. It is also evident from the comparison that none of the techniques used tool to illustrate the nfrs. Therefore, we can say that nfrs have very rare support of the tools as well. It is also concluded that almost all the techniques propose a specific way to cater the issue of the integration of nfrs and architecture. It is also evident that the focused issue is not being discussed through a practical approach, and shows that this issue can only be argued. That is why the techniques focus scenarios and experience-based approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>NF Attributes</th>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Case-study</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nelson et al (2000)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ZCL Framework</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>An appointment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Configuration model (CL)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lopez and Hernan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Integrating NFRs with use-case</td>
<td>Stock behavior system</td>
<td>Use case diagram</td>
<td>Scenario-based Approach</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nelson et al (2001)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Parmenides framework</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Block diagram</td>
<td>Mapping strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barbara et al (2002)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Experience-based</td>
<td>Navigation system of rocket</td>
<td>Block diagram</td>
<td>Experience-based Approach</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lin Liu Eric Yu</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Scenario-based Approach</td>
<td>Mobile telecom system</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Use Case Maps (UCM)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Paul et al</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CBSP approach</td>
<td>Natural disaster</td>
<td>Block diagram</td>
<td>CBSP taxonomy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cortellesa et al</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>XML-based Approach</td>
<td>Set &amp; counter application</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Integrating NFRs &amp; FRs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barbara et al (2003)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Experience-based</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Class diagram</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jane Cleland-Huang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Goal-oriented</td>
<td>A telephony system</td>
<td>Block diagram</td>
<td>GCT model</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lin Liao</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Survey-based</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Goal graph</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion.** Software architecture is widely used to address the functional requirements of the application. A number of techniques, methodologies, languages, tools, and processes are introduced to cater the functional requirements of the software. An important consideration is that, the software architecture addresses the non-functional requirements as well. Specially, runtime qualities of the software system (such as performance, security, availability and fault tolerance) are thoroughly addressed by the architecture.

In this paper, we have surveyed the integrating techniques of the software architecture and NFRs in order to check their applicability in the domain of real life. We have analyzed the reported techniques on the basis of our evaluation criteria and have presented a comparison. We conclude that non-functional requirements should also take into account at architectural level. Functional requirements and non-functional requirements must be deal together in order to achieve better interconnection between design and requirements.
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