



Cinders: The continuous integration and delivery architecture framework: Journal-first selected article - Extended abstract

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2026-04-05 19:27 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Stahl, D., Bosch, J. (2018). Cinders: The continuous integration and delivery architecture framework: Journal-first selected article - Extended abstract. ACM International Conference Proceeding Series: 128-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3202710.3203165>

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Cinders: The Continuous Integration and Delivery Architecture Framework

Journal-First Selected Article – Extended Abstract

Daniel Ståhl
Ericsson AB
Linköping, Sweden
daniel.stahl@ericsson.com

Jan Bosch
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
jan@janbosch.com

ABSTRACT

This extended abstract summarizes an article, which has been published in *Information and Software Technology* and was selected for the *Journal-First* presentations at the *International Conference on Software and System Process (ICSSP 2018)*.

Full Article Reference. Daniel Ståhl and Jan Bosch. 2017. Cinders: The continuous integration and delivery architecture framework. *Information and Software Technology* 83 (2017), 76–93.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → **Architecture description languages; Software development methods; Software configuration management and version control systems; Agile software development;**

KEYWORDS

cinders; software integration; software testing; continuous integration; continuous delivery; architecture framework

ACM Reference Format:

Daniel Ståhl and Jan Bosch. 2018. Cinders: The Continuous Integration and Delivery Architecture Framework: Journal-First Selected Article – Extended Abstract. In *ICSSP '18: International Conference on the Software and Systems Process 2018 (ICSSP '18), May 26–27, 2018, Gothenburg, Sweden*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3202710.3203165>

1 SUMMARY

The popular agile practices of continuous integration and delivery have become an essential part of the software development process in many companies, yet effective methods and tools to support design, description and communication of continuous integration and delivery systems are lacking. This paper addresses the problem of constructing systems for rapidly and frequently transforming source code changes into verified and deliverable software product revisions with known content, known functionality and known quality – through software integration and test – in a controlled and methodical way.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

ICSSP '18, May 26–27, 2018, Gothenburg, Sweden

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-6459-1/18/05.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3202710.3203165>

Historically, the problem of transforming lines of source code into functioning, verified products running in their target environment could be regarded as a question of enterprise architecture: of organizational responsibilities and manual processes. With the advent and growth of continuous integration [2, 3] and delivery [4, 5], however, and the automation this brings, this is increasingly becoming a domain of software engineering: we see ever more sophisticated software systems being constructed, with the purpose of compiling, integrating, testing, delivering and deploying other software.

While such systems are generally perceived as adding value and increasing the efficiency of the development project, we have found in previous work that the exact nature of these benefits is highly uncertain and varies from case to case [8]. Furthermore, even though there are numerous popular tools that do much of the heavy lifting in these integration systems, they only address isolated parts of a very large problem domain. In all our industry case studies [8, 9, 11, 12] we have never found a complete off-the-shelf solution for continuous integration. Rather, the integration systems we find often use similar tools, but configured differently, put to different purposes and integrated with one another in varying constellations. Not surprisingly, a review of literature reveals that reported continuous integration systems display a high degree of variance [10]. In other words, as a rule, continuous integration and delivery systems are highly customized and purpose-built software products in their own right.

This recognition leads up to the research question that drives the study presented in this article: *In what way can the paradigm of architecture frameworks favorably be applied to facilitate the design and description of continuous integration and delivery systems?*

Similarly to the variance in system design, there is little consensus on the exact definition of continuous integration and delivery, particularly as opposed to related terms such as continuous testing, continuous release or continuous deployment. For the purposes of this paper, we use the term *continuous integration and delivery system* to mean any system of automated activities performed in order to transform source code into working and potentially shippable and deployable products with known quality, content and functionality, i.e. including compilation, linking, packaging, testing, profiling, documentation generation and much more, serving to ensure that “the software can be released to production at any time” [4].

In this paper we investigate the applicability of existing architectural frameworks and two built-for-purpose modeling techniques

– ASIF [10] and CIViT [7] – to the problem of designing and documenting continuous integration and delivery systems. Based on this investigation a new architectural framework, Cinders, is proposed and subsequently evaluated in an industry context.

2 NEW INSIGHTS

There have been two noteworthy developments since the original journal article was published. First, as noted in the summary above, there is a lack of consensus in industry as well as in research as to the exact meaning of terms such as continuous integration and continuous delivery. In subsequent work we have investigated this further and analyzed usage of the terms in published literature. Based on this investigation we then propose less ambiguous definitions of a set of related terms [13]. Relevant in this context, we argue that continuous integration is a “*developer practice* where developers integrate their work frequently, usually each person integrates at least daily, leading to multiple integrations per day” and that continuous delivery is a “*development practice* where every change is treated as a potential release candidate to be frequently and rapidly evaluated through one’s continuous delivery pipeline, and that one is always able to deploy and/or release the latest working version, but may decide not to, e.g. for business reasons”. These definitions are in line with, but more elaborate than, the definition of a continuous integration and delivery system provided in this article.

The second development is that the Eiffel protocol for real time automated documentation of continuous integration and delivery activities, which is mentioned in passing in the original article, has since been released as open source along with multiple service implementations [1]. The Eiffel protocol is based on similar concepts as Cinders, and even though there is currently no open source implementation of Cinders descriptions generated from Eiffel data, the data model of Cinders is well suited for such automated generation and would fit well into the Eiffel community’s implementation architecture.

3 CONCLUSION

In this article we establish that the construction of continuous integration and delivery systems is an area of considerable investment in the industry, yet lacking in supporting tools and methods, coinciding with a tendency by studied industry cases to not address its challenges using as rigorous an approach as in regular product development. Based on thematic analysis of statements in literature, twelve requirements for an architectural framework for continuous integration and delivery are phrased. Using these requirements, existing architecture frameworks as listed by ISO/IEC/IEEE [6] are evaluated, finding that none satisfactorily addresses the identified requirements.

Consequently Cinders, a new architecture framework designed to address the identified requirements, is presented. Influenced by prominent enterprise and software architecture frameworks, Cinders offers four separate *viewpoints* of the same underlying data model, with six optional *layers* of additional information which can

be used to adjust the focus and level of detail within each of those viewpoints, as fits the particular use case and circumstances. This framework is then applied in a workshop format in two separate industry cases, and interviews are conducted with a total of twelve practitioners.

Based on this work it is shown that a single architectural framework can be designed to encompass the previous continuous integration and delivery modeling techniques ASIF and CIViT, representing their specific concerns as viewpoints rendered from the same underlying data model. It is also shown that this architecture framework represents an improvement over these techniques, in that it separates different types of entity relationships into separate viewpoints, allows the level of abstraction of each viewpoint to be modified, shows confidence afforded by conducted activities, represents both manual and automated test activities, can map activities onto physical environments and can visualize overlapping test activities. In workshops and interviews with practitioners of continuous integration and delivery in two separate companies it is confirmed that Cinders is viewed as relevant and useful in an industry setting, even while areas of possible improvement are identified. Therefore we find that Cinders represents a significant step forward in continuous integration and delivery architecture design and description, constituting a relevant and helpful tool for industry professionals to better document, analyze and communicate their systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2018. Eiffel Community. <http://eiffel-community.github.io>. (2018). [Online; accessed 27-March-2018].
- [2] Kent Beck. 2000. *Extreme programming explained: embrace change*. Addison-Wesley Professional.
- [3] Martin Fowler. 2006. Continuous Integration. <http://www.martinfowler.com/articles/continuousIntegration.html>. (2006). [Online; accessed 12-February-2016].
- [4] Martin Fowler. 2013. Continuous Delivery. <http://martinfowler.com/bliki/ContinuousDelivery.html>. (2013). [Online; accessed 20-November-2015].
- [5] Jez Humble and David Farley. 2010. *Continuous delivery: reliable software releases through build, test, and deployment automation*. Pearson Education.
- [6] ISO/IEC/IEEE 42010. 2015. ISO/IEC/IEEE 42010 Survey of Architecture Frameworks. <http://www.iso-architecture.org/42010/afs/frameworks-table.html>. (2015). [Online; accessed 12-March-2015].
- [7] Agneta Nilsson, Jan Bosch, and Christian Berger. 2014. Visualizing testing activities to support continuous integration: A multiple case study. In *Agile Processes in Software Engineering and Extreme Programming*. Springer, 171–186.
- [8] Daniel Ståhl and Jan Bosch. 2013. Experienced benefits of continuous integration in industry software product development: A case study. In *The 12th IASTED International Conference on Software Engineering*. 736–743.
- [9] Daniel Ståhl and Jan Bosch. 2014. Automated software integration flows in industry: a multiple-case study. In *Companion Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering*. ACM, 54–63.
- [10] Daniel Ståhl and Jan Bosch. 2014. Modeling continuous integration practice differences in industry software development. *Journal of Systems and Software* 87 (2014), 48–59.
- [11] Daniel Ståhl and Jan Bosch. 2016. Industry application of continuous integration modeling: a multiple-case study. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering Companion*. ACM, 270–279.
- [12] Daniel Ståhl, Kristofer Hallén, and Jan Bosch. 2017. Achieving traceability in large scale continuous integration and delivery: Deployment, usage and validation of the Eiffel framework. *Empirical Software Engineering* 22, 3 (2017), 967–995.
- [13] Daniel Ståhl, Torvald Mårtensson, and Jan Bosch. 2017. Continuous Practices and DevOps: Beyond the Buzz, What Does It All Mean?. In *43rd Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA)*. IEEE, 440–448.