Softwaretechnik
Model Driven Architecture
Meta Modeling

Prof. Dr. Peter Thiemann

Universität Freiburg

22.06.2009

Metamodeling

Intro

- What?
  - meta = above
  - Define an ontology of concepts for a domain.
  - Define the *vocabulary* and *grammatical rules* of a modeling language.
  - Define a domain specific language (DSL).
- Why?
  - Concise means of specifying the set models for a domain.
  - Precise definition of modeling language.
- How?
  - Grammars and attributions for textbased languages.
  - Metamodeling generalizes to arbitrary languages (*e.g.*, graphical)

Metamodeling

Uses

- Construction of DSLs
- Validation of Models
  (checking against metamodel)
- Model-to-model transformation
  (defined in terms of the metamodels)
- Model-to-code transformation
- Tool integration

Excursion: Classifiers and Instances

- Classifier diagrams may also contain instances
- Instance description may include
    - name (optional)
    - classification by zero or more classifiers
    - kind of instance
        - instance of class: object
        - instance of association: link
        - etc
    - optional specification of values

Excursion: Notation for Instances

- Instances use the same notation as classifier
  - Box to indicate the instance
  - Name compartment contains
    $\underline{\mathit{name}\colon \mathit{classifier}, \mathit{classifier}\ldots}$
    $\underline{\mathit{name}\colon \mathit{classifier}}$
    $\underline{\colon \mathit{classifier}}$ anonymous instance
    $\underline{\colon}$ unclassified, anonymous instance
  - Attribute in the classifier may give rise to like-named *slot* with optional value
  - Association with the classifier may give rise to *link* to other association end
    direction must coincide with navigability

Excursion: Notation for Instances (Graphical)



Terminology/Syntax

well-formedness rules

- abstract syntax
  just structure, how are the language concepts composed
- concrete syntax
  defines specific notation
- typical use:
  parser maps concrete syntax to abstract syntax

Terms/Abstract Syntax

Example: Arithmetic expressions

- abstract syntax

```
data Expr = Const String
          | Var String
          | Binop Op Expr Expr
data Op   = Add | Sub | Mul | Div

Binop Mul (Const "2")
          (Binop Add (Var "x") (Const "3"))
```

- concrete syntax

$$\begin{array}{lcl} E & ::= & \mathtt{c} \mid \mathtt{x} \mid E\ B\ E \mid (E) \\ B & ::= & + \mid - \mid * \mid / \end{array}$$

```
2 * (x + 3)
```

Terms/Abstract Syntax

Example: UML class diagram

- concrete syntax



- abstract syntax



Terms/Static Semantics

- Static semantics defines well-formedness rules beyond the syntax
- Examples
  - “Variables have to be defined before use”
  - Type system of a programming language
    `"hello" * 4` is syntactically correct Java, but rejected
- UML: static semantics via OCL expressions
- Use: detection of modeling/transformation errors

Terms/Domain Specific Language (DSL)

- Purpose: formal expression of key aspects of a domain
- Metamodel of DSL defines abstract syntax and static semantics
- Additionally:
  - concrete syntax (close to domain)
  - dynamic semantics
    - for understanding
    - for automatic tools
- Different degrees of complexity possible
  configuration options with validity check
  graphical DSL with domain specific editor

Model and Metamodel

Model and Metamodel



- Insight: **Every model is an instance of a metamodel.**
- Essential: *instance-of* relationship
- Every element must have a classifying metaelement which
  - contains the metadata and
  - is accessible from the element
- Relation Model:Metamodel is like Object:Class
- Definition of Metamodel by Meta-metamodel
- $\Rightarrow$ infinite tower of metamodels
- $\Rightarrow$ "meta" relation always relative to a model

Metamodeling a la OMG

- OMG defines a standard (MOF) for metamodeling
- MOF (Meta Object Facilities) used for defining UML
- Confusion alert:
  - MOF and UML share syntax (classifier and instance diagrams)
  - MOF shares names of modeling elements with UML (*e.g.*, Class)
- Approach
  - Restrict infinite number of metalevels to *four*
  - Last level is deemed "self-describing"

Metamodeling and OCL



- OCL constraints are independent of the modeling language and the metalevel
- OCL on layer M$n+1$ restricts instances on layer Mn

OMG's Four Metalevels



Layer M0: Instances

- Level of the running system
- Contains actual objects, *e.g.*, customers, seminars, bank accounts, with filled slots for attributes etc
- Example: object diagram

Layer M1: Model

- Level of system models
- Example:
  - UML model of a software system
  - Class diagram contains modeling elements: classes, attributes, operations, associations, generalizations, ...
- Elements of M1 categorize elements at layer M0
- Each element of M0 is an instance of M1 element
- No other instances are allowed at layer M0

Relation between M0 and M1



Layer M2: Metamodel

"Model of Model"

- Level of modeling element definition
- Concepts of M2 categorize instances at layer M1
- Elements of M2 model *categorize* M1 elements: classes, attributes, operations, associations, generalizations, . . .
- Examples
  - Each class in M1 is an instance of some class-describing element in layer M2 (in this case, a *Metaclass*)
  - Each association in M1 is an instance of some association-describing element in layer M2 (a *Metaassociation*)
  - and so on

Relation between M1 and M2



Layer M3: Meta-Metamodel

- Level for defining the definition of modeling elements
- Elements of M3 model *categorize* M2 elements: Metaclass, Metaassociation, Metaattribute, etc
- Typical element of M3 model: MOF class
- Examples
  - The metaclasses Class, Association, Attribute, etc are all instances of MOF class
- M3 layer is self-describing

Relation between M2 and M3



Overview of Layers



Excerpt from MOF/UML



Extending UML
Designing a DSL

Designing a DSL

- Definition of a new M2 language from scratch too involved
- Typical approach: Extension of UML
- Extension Mechanisms
  - Extension of the UML 2 metamodel
    applicable to all MOF-defined metamodels
  - Extension using stereotypes (the UML 1.x way)
  - Extension using profiles (the UML 2 way)

Extending the UML Metamodel



- MOF sanctions the derivation of a new metaclass **CM::Component** from **UML::Class**
- **CM::Component** is an instance of **MOF::Classifier**
- the generalization is an instance of MOF's **generalizes** association

Extending the UML Metamodel/Concrete Syntax



1. Explicit instance of metaclass
2. Name of metaclass as stereotype
3. Convention
4. Tagged value with metaclass
5. Own graphical representation (if supported)

Adding to a Class



- "just" inheriting from **UML::Class** leads to an identical copy
- Adding an attribute to the **CM::Component** metaclass leads to
  - an attribute value slot in each instance
  - notation: tagged value (typed in UML 2)

Extension Using Stereotypes (UML 1.x)

- Simple specialization mechanism of UML
- No recourse to MOF required
- Tagged Values untyped
- No new metaassociations possible

Extending Using Profiles (UML 2)



- Extension of the stereotype mechanism
- Requires "Extension arrow" as a *new UML language construct* (generalization with filled arrowhead)
- Not: generalization, implementation, stereotyped dependency, association, . . .
- Attributes ⇒ typed tagged values
- Multiple stereotypes possible

More on Profiles

- Profiles make UML into a *family of languages*
- Each member is defined by application of one or more profiles to the base UML metamodel
- Tools should be able to load profiles and corresponding transformations
- Profiles have three ingredients
  - stereotypes
  - tagges values
  - constraints
- Profiles can only impose further restrictions
- Profiles are formally defined through a metamodel

Profile Metamodel



Example Profile for EJB



Further Aspects of Profiles

- Stereotypes can inherit from other stereotypes
- Stereotypes may be abstract
- Constraints of a stereotype are enforced for the stereotyped classifier
- Profiles are relative to a reference metamodel
  e.g., the UML metamodel or an existing profile
- Most tools today do not enforce profile-based modeling restrictions, so why bother with profiles?
  - constraints for documentation
  - specialized UML tools
  - validation by transformer / program generator