

# On the Challenges of Transforming UVL to IVML

Prankur Agarwal

JKU/Dynatrace Co-Innovation Lab,  
LIT CPS Lab  
Dynatrace Research  
Linz, Austria  
prankur.agarwal@dynatrace.com

Kevin Feichtinger

CRC 1608, KASTEL – Dependability  
of Software-intensive Systems  
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology  
Germany  
kevin.feichtinger@kit.edu

Klaus Schmid

Software Systems Engineering,  
Institute of Computer Science  
University of Hildesheim  
Germany  
schmid@sse.uni-hildesheim.de

Holger Eichelberger

Software Systems Engineering,  
Institute of Computer Science  
University of Hildesheim  
Germany  
eichelberger@sse.uni-hildesheim.de

Rick Rabiser

CDL VaSiCS, LIT CPS Lab  
Johannes Kepler University Linz  
Austria  
rick.rabiser@jku.at

## ABSTRACT

Software product line techniques encourage the reuse and adaptation of software components for creating customized products or software systems. These different product variants have commonalities and differences, which are managed by variability modeling. Over the past three decades, both academia and industry have developed numerous variability modeling methods, each with its own advantages and disadvantages. Many of these methods have demonstrated their utility within specific domains or applications. However, comprehending the capabilities and differences among these approaches to pinpoint the most suitable one for a particular use case remains challenging. Thus, new modeling techniques and tailored tools for handling variability are frequently created. Transitioning between variability models through transformations from different approaches can help in understanding the benefits and drawbacks of different modeling approaches. However, implementing such transformations presents challenges, such as semantic preservation and avoiding information loss. TRAVART is a tool that helps with transitioning between different approaches by enabling the transformation of variability models into other variability models of different types. This paper discusses the challenges for such transformations between UVL and IVML. It also presents a one-way transformation from the UVL to IVML with as little information loss as possible.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering** → **Software product lines.**

## KEYWORDS

Software product lines, variability modeling, variability model transformations, transformation challenges.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Software Product Line (SPL) engineering encourages the reuse of predefined software artifacts for creating tailored variations of the same software to meet specific customer requirements [8, 10]. Variability modeling plays a crucial role in SPL engineering [10, 32] as it allows capturing the common and variable characteristics of a

set of (software) systems in dedicated models [6]. These models are then used to derive and customize different software products with varying features and functionalities [6].

Over the past 30 years, various variability modeling approaches have been developed, each having their own advantages and disadvantages [2, 6, 9, 22, 34, 38]. The Feature-Oriented Domain Analysis (FODA) approach, introduced by Kang et al. [26], is the basis of most feature modeling approaches available today. Another approach is decision modeling, which has been influenced by the Synthesis method [11, 37]. Even within a single approach, there are multiple variants. For example, in feature modeling, one can use academic approaches/tools such as FeatureIDE [28] or commercial ones such as pure::variants [33]. Similarly, in decision modeling, one can use DOPLER [13] or Integrated Variability Modeling Language (IVML) [15, 16]. Beyond these common approaches [12] also textual variability modeling languages [3], Orthogonal Variability Modeling (OVM) [32], Unified Modeling Language (UML)-based variability modeling [23], and the Common Variability Language (CVL) [24] are available. Additionally, various open-source communities and industries have developed their own solutions to model variability. For instance, the KConfig language supporting configuration of the Linux Kernel [39] and the Component Definition Language (CDL) [7] from the eCos [43] operating system. Despite numerous efforts, such as the CVL [24] or Universal Variability Language (UVL) [40], there is no officially accepted standard in the variability modeling community, today.

The lack of standardization has led to the need for tools that support multiple variability modeling languages through importers and exporters. However, most of these approaches and tools have a limited lifespan [2, 5, 27, 31]. As a result, researchers and practitioners often resort to creating new approaches instead of exploring existing ones [18] and potentially re-using, customizing, and integrating them. However, various differences among approaches make it hard for researchers and practitioners to compare their advantages and disadvantages. Thus, it would be advantageous to concentrate on enhancing the interoperability of current variability modeling tools [31] to choose the most suitable approach for a given use case. TRAVART [20] was developed to increase the interoperability of existing variability modeling tools by transforming

different variability models into each other while preserving the variability to its maximum by minimizing information loss [21]. TRAVART [20] uses UVL [40] as a pivot language and already supports various variability modeling languages like FeatureIDE feature models [28], DOPLER [13], OVM [32], Product-Process-Resource Domain-Specific Language (PPR-DSL) [29, 30], and pure::variants [33, 35]. However, there are many more languages that are currently not supported, such as the IVML [16].

In this paper, we discuss the differences between UVL [40] and IVML [16] and the resulting challenges for their transformation. We also describe the process of deriving and developing transformations from UVL [40] to IVML [16] using TRAVART [20].

## 2 BACKGROUND

In this section, we discuss relevant background and related work to build transformations between UVL [40] and IVML [16] using an extended Onlineshop case study [1, 18].

### 2.1 Universal Variability Language

The UVL is a community effort towards a unified language for variability models developed and maintained by the MODEVAR initiative<sup>1</sup> [4]. UVL is a feature modeling approach that should allow easy access to datasets and analyses used by other researchers. Listing 1 shows the UVL model for the extended Onlineshop [1, 18] case study. A feature can be *abstract* (no implementation and for grouping purposes, e.g., Payment in line 6) or *concrete* (actual implementations of the feature, e.g., Catalog in line 12). Furthermore, a feature can be *mandatory* (e.g., UserManagement in line 18) or *optional* (e.g., Search in line 17). Among features of the feature model, relations exist, like features of a feature group can be *alternatives* (meaning only one of the feature can be selected, e.g., DebitCard and CreditCard in lines 8 and 9) or an *or* group (meaning at least one of the features must be selected, e.g., Mobile, Tablet and PC in lines 38-40). Additionally, features can depend on each other, which is modeled using constraints (cf. lines 42-45).

Different usage scenarios often require different variability languages. However, adding more language features to UVL can complicate its integration into existing tools. Thus, UVL utilizes language levels [42] for more advanced language features [41]. UVL currently supports three language levels - Boolean, Arithmetic, and Type. The Type level supports basic datatypes like String, Boolean, Integer, and Real.

```

1 namespace Onlineshop
2
3 features
4   Onlineshop {abstract true}
5     mandatory
6       Payment {abstract true}
7         alternative
8           DebitCard
9           CreditCard
10        ProductSelection {abstract true}
11          mandatory
12            Catalog
13          optional
14            Categories
15            Sort

```

<sup>1</sup>MODEVAR initiative – <https://modevar.github.io/>

```

16 optional
17   Search
18   UserManagement {abstract true}
19   or
20     Orders
21     Security
22     Payments
23     Wishlist
24 optional
25   Newsletter
26 mandatory
27   Design
28   mandatory
29     Responsive
30     Review
31     [2..3]
32     Stars
33     Numerical
34     Comments
35   ShoppingBasket
36   Platform
37   or
38     Mobile
39     Tablet
40     PC
41 constraints
42   Sort | Search
43   Search => Security
44   Payments => !Security
45   Security => !Payments

```

Listing 1: UVL [40] Model for the extended Onlineshop case study [1, 18].

### 2.2 Integrated Variability Modeling Language

IVML [16] is a text-based variability modeling language that helps describe configurations of variability-rich software ecosystems [15]. IVML is implemented as part of EASY-Producer [14, 36], a toolset for creating and transforming product lines defined by IVML models more effectively. IVML unifies variability modeling and configuration into a single language, remains implementation-agnostic, and employs strong typing with common types like Integer and Boolean. IVML is divided into two parts: a core modeling language and an advanced modeling language that extends the core language [15, 25].

One of the core concepts in IVML is to represent variability as a typed variable [15]. Boolean variables are utilized to represent optional features, user-defined enumerations capture alternatives, and collections model multiple selections [25]. Constraints, similar to those seen in Object Constraint Language (OCL), including relational expressions and quantifiers, are imposed to effectively shape and confine the permissible selections. IVML also introduces the concept of compounds to encapsulate various forms of variabilities. A compound can be used to characterize an individual variability, a multiple selection within a collection, or even for nesting feature modeling to construct a hierarchical structure. Within IVML, variabilities can be refined, restricted, or shared through their types. Compound types can inherit variables from their parent types and add new ones through type refinement, which is similar to inheritance in object-oriented languages. On the other hand, type restriction defines new types by constraining existing ones, allowing for

more specialized variability types. Sharing is another powerful capability that allows variables to reference each other, with typed references ensuring that valid target types are maintained, even in the presence of type refinements. Value bindings are created by using either assignment or value propagation constraints, and variables can have default values to simplify configurations. IVML annotations also support default values and constraints, making the modeling language more expressive.

Listing 2 shows an IVML model for the extended Onlineshop case study [1, 18]. It contains enumerations (cf. Lines 2, 8, 12, and 15) and sets (cf. Lines 9, 13, and 16) to showcase the variability. The size function is used to define the cardinality (cf. Lines 10, 14, and 17) whereas isDefined (cf. Line 4) is used to define a mandatory feature. Line 18 adds propositional logic constraints and lines 19-21 define implication constraints.

```

1 project OnlineShop {
2   enum PaymentTypes {DebitCard, CreditCard};
3   PaymentTypes Payment;
4   isDefined(Payment);
5   Boolean Categories;
6   Boolean Sort;
7   Boolean Search;
8   enum UserManagementOptions {Orders, Security,
9     Payments, Wishlist};
10  setOf(UserManagementOptions) UserManagement;
11  size(UserManagement) >= 1;
12  Boolean Newsletter;
13  enum ReviewTypes {Stars, Numerical, Comments};
14  setOf(ReviewTypes) Review;
15  size(Review) >= 2;
16  enum PlatformType {Mobile, Tablet, PC};
17  setOf(PlatformType) Platform;
18  size(Platform) >= 1;
19  Sort or Search;
20  Search implies includes(UserManagement,
21    UserManagementOptions.Security);
22  includes(UserManagement, UserManagementOptions.
23    Payments) implies (includes(UserManagement,
24    UserManagementOptions.Security) <> true);
25  includes(UserManagement, UserManagementOptions.
26    Security) implies (includes(UserManagement,
27    UserManagementOptions.Payments) <> true);
28 }

```

Listing 2: IVML [16] Model for the extended Onlineshop case study [1, 18].

### 3 IVML VS. UVL: COMPARISON AND TRANSFORMATION CHALLENGES

UVL [40] and IVML [16] are two different languages for describing variability models in SPL. They have some similarities, but they also differ in how they express syntax, semantics, and features. This section compares these two languages in detail, focusing on explaining the essential transformation challenges.

UVL is a result of a collaborative effort to create a standard format for variability modeling [40] by the MODEVAR initiative [4]. IVML is a language initially created in the FP7 INDENICA project to handle variability in service-based systems [15, 16]. UVL is based on the idea of a feature model, which is a tree-like representation of common and variable features. A feature model has a root feature, which represents the product line, and a set of sub-features, which

represent options for the product line. UVL uses indentation to define feature hierarchy and keywords such as mandatory, optional, alternative, and or to define feature cardinality and variability. On the contrary, IVML is based on the idea of characterizing the variability space in a more general manner and defining specific configurations in the same language. An IVML model consists of declarations that define variability decisions, variability kinds through types, attributes, and constraints. IVML uses a syntax similar to Java or C# and constraints to declaratively define relationships between features and their parent features or to assign decision values. In their simplest forms UVL does not support data types, while IVML does.

UVL only supports basic constraints with propositional logic [40, 41], while IVML offers more expressive power with arithmetic expressions, assignments, and attribute definitions up to first-order logic [15, 16]. UVL is integrated with various software tools, such as FeatureIDE [28] and TRAVART [20]. IVML, however, is mainly used by the EASy-Producer tool suite [14, 36].

In summary, UVL and IVML have different objectives. UVL is designed as a universal language that can express the core of any feature model. Its aim is to offer a standard format that enables the sharing and compatibility of feature models among various tools and platforms. IVML is intentionally created as a Domain Specific Language (DSL), customized to address the specific challenges and demands of service-oriented systems. It acts as a powerful language that can handle complex variability modeling tasks such as analysis, configuration, adaptation, and evolution.

Transforming between UVL and IVML is challenging due to their differences, especially in their constraint languages. IVML is more expressive than UVL. UVL can only handle a limited set of constraints that IVML supports. For instance, UVL does not allow constraints such as if, def, etc. Furthermore, UVL does not have the advanced modeling features of IVML such as assign, conflicts, etc. This implies that a conversion from UVL to IVML is possible (but some concepts need to be adjusted, especially regarding structure), while a conversion from IVML to UVL will necessarily result in losing information for more complex IVML models.

## 4 INITIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

In this section, we provide a detailed description of the methods used to perform a one-way transformation from UVL [40] to IVML [16], taking the differences between the two approaches into account (cf. Section 3). Building on earlier work by El-Sharkawy et al. [17], the main objective of this transformation is to preserve the variability as possible while ignoring structural losses [18, 21]. This is because, even when the new modeling elements are added, the fundamental goal still is to protect the configuration space.

During the transformation, we use special names for newly introduced model elements. These special names help maintain name uniqueness and allow distinguishing between old and new model elements for readability. By using these special names, we try to create a system that everyone can understand and work with easily. The suffixes used to create these special names are:

- Enum Declaration: \_\_ENUM\_\_<number>

- Enum Instance Declaration:  
\_\_ENUM\_\_<number>\_\_INSTANCE
- Set Declaration: \_\_SET\_\_<number>
- Set Instance Declaration: \_\_SET\_\_<number>\_\_INSTANCE
- Compound Declaration: \_\_COMPOUND\_\_<number>
- Compound Instance Declaration:  
\_\_COMPOUND\_\_<number>\_\_INSTANCE

In these conventions, the *number* is the number (starting from 1) of the Enum, Set, or Compound created from the same parent.

The one-way transformation from UVL to IVML mainly focuses on three concepts of UVL - features, or group, and alternative group. If it is a part of an or-group, or an alternative-group, the feature is either mandatory or optional. Then it is directly transformed into a Boolean variable. For mandatory features, in the target model, an additional `isDefined` constraint is added to the created model during the transformation (cf. Lines 5-7 in Listing 2, which is without suffixes due to space constraints). Moreover, the mandatory features directly from the root feature or with all the parents as mandatory features, are ignored during transformation as they do not contribute to the variability. For instance, feature `Catalog` in Listing 1 is not transformed and hence is not present in Listing 2. An alternative group is transformed into an enumeration and then this enumeration is instantiated. Further constraints can be added to this created instance of the enumeration depending on the parent feature type of the group. The constraint is of the form `<parent_inclusion_condition> implies isDefined(enumeration_instance)` (cf. Lines 2-4 in Listing 2). Similarly, the or group is transformed into an enumeration but instead of creating an instance of this enumeration, a set is defined of this enumeration. This set has all the possible combinations of choices from this group, including none and all. Lastly, we add a constraint for the size of this set to be at least 1. The constraint is of the form `<parent_inclusion_condition> implies size(set) >= 1` (cf. Lines 8-10 in Listing 2).

The next step after transforming all the features is to transform the constraints. Table 1 shows the mapping of constraints. The table reveals that the transformation of constraints is simple and straightforward, and it is like a one-to-one mapping between the two languages. For example, the constraint `Sort | Search` in line 42 of Listing 1 is directly transformed to `Sort or Search` as shown in line 18 of Listing 2. Further, the implication constraint, `Search => Security` in line 43 of Listing 1 is transformed to `Search implies includes(UserManagement, UserManagementOptions.Security)` as shown in line 19 of Listing 2. It is important to note the type of the variable during the transformation of constraints. For instance, the `includes` keyword is used for checking whether a particular value exists in a set (cf. Lines 20-21 in Listing 2). This simplicity in constraint transformation helps in maintaining the variability and hence prevents information loss.

Currently, the verification of the transformed model is restricted to its syntax correctness, using the IVML parser of the EASy-Producer [14, 36] tool. We aim to extend that in future work.

**Table 1: Constraint mappings for UVL [40] and IVML [16].**

UVL	IVML
and / or / not	and / or / not
iff	iff
implies	implies
len(<string_feature>)	size(<string_variable>)
floor(<numeric_feature>)	floor(<numeric_variable>)
> / >= / < / <=	> / >= / < / <=
== / !=	== / !=
add expression	add
subtract expression	subtract
multiplication expression	multiplication
division expression	division

## 5 CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH AGENDA

In this paper, we described the challenges of transforming UVL and IVML models. We also explored a way to perform a one-way transformation of UVL models into IVML models. We mapped UVL concepts to their IVML equivalents with a focus on avoiding any loss of information in terms of variability and semantics. Our mapping strategies also prioritized human readability while transforming the languages.

In future work, we aim to further investigate the mappings of the concepts in these languages and also implement the one-way transformation from IVML to UVL, and round-trip transformations from both IVML and UVL. Moreover, we plan to work on verification methods for the transformed models as well as on optimizing the implementation of the transformation. These verification methods will include but are not limited to, generating the valid and invalid configurations of the original UVL model and applying them to the transformed IVML model. We will integrate these transformations in the existing transformation tool TRAVART. Lastly, the support for model evolution has yet to be investigated for IVML based on preliminary work [19].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The financial support by the Christian Doppler Research Association, the Austrian Federal Ministry for Digital and Economic Affairs and the National Foundation for Research, Technology and Development is gratefully acknowledged. Partially funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – CRC 1608 – 501798263. This work is partially supported by the German Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK, IIP-Ecosphere – 01MK20006C).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Taslim Arif, Frank de Boer, Michiel Helvensteijn, Karina Villela, and Peter Wong. 2012. Evaluation of Modeling. Deliverable 5.3 of project FP7-231620 (HATS). Website. <http://www.hats-project.eu/sites/default/files/Deliverable5.3.pdf#page=55.2012>
- [2] Rabih Bashroush, Muhammad Garba, Rick Rabiser, Iris Groher, and Goetz Botterweck. 2017. Case tool support for variability management in software product lines. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 50, 1 (2017), 14:1–14:45.

- [3] Maurice H. ter Beek, Klaus Schmid, and Holger Eichelberger. 2019. Textual Variability Modeling Languages: An Overview and Considerations. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume B (SPLC '19)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 151–157.
- [4] David Benavides, Rick Rabiser, Don Batory, and Mathieu Acher. 2019. First International Workshop on Languages for Modelling Variability (MODEVAR 2019). In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume A (SPLC '19)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 323.
- [5] Thorsten Berger and Philippe Collet. 2019. Usage Scenarios for a Common Feature Modeling Language. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume B (SPLC '19)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 174–181.
- [6] Thorsten Berger, Ralf Rublack, Divya Nair, Joanne M Atlee, Martin Becker, Krzysztof Czarnecki, and Andrzej Wąsowski. 2013. A survey of variability modeling in industrial practice. In *Proc. of the 7th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-intensive Systems*. ACM, 7–14.
- [7] Thorsten Berger, Steven She, Rafael Lotufo, Andrzej Wąsowski, and Krzysztof Czarnecki. 2010. Variability modeling in the real: a perspective from the operating systems domain. In *Proc. of the IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. ACM, 73–82.
- [8] J. Bosch. 2000. *Design and Use of Software Architectures: Adopting and Evolving a Product-line Approach*. Addison-Wesley. <https://books.google.at/books?id=FDfyWknLvMYC>
- [9] Lianping Chen and Muhammad Ali Babar. 2011. A systematic review of evaluation of variability management approaches in software product lines. *Information and Software Technology* 53, 4 (2011), 344–362.
- [10] P. Clements and L. Northrop. 2002. *Software Product Lines: Practices and Patterns*. Addison-Wesley.
- [11] Software Productivity Consortium. 1991. *Synthesis Guidebook*. Technical Report. SPC-91122-MC. Herndon, Virginia: Software Productivity Consortium.
- [12] Krzysztof Czarnecki, Paul Grünbacher, Rick Rabiser, Klaus Schmid, and Andrzej Wąsowski. 2012. Cool Features and Tough Decisions: A Comparison of Variability Modeling Approaches. In *Proc. of the 6th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems*. ACM, 173–182.
- [13] Deepak Dhungana, Paul Grünbacher, and Rick Rabiser. 2011. The DOPLER Meta-Tool for Decision-Oriented Variability Modeling: A Multiple Case Study. *Automated Software Engineering* 18, 1 (2011), 77–114.
- [14] Holger Eichelberger, Sascha El-Sharkawy, Christian Kröher, and Klaus Schmid. 2014. EASy-Producer: Product Line Development for Variant-Rich Ecosystems. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Software Product Line Conference: Companion Volume for Workshops, Demonstrations and Tools - Volume 2 (SPLC '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 133–137.
- [15] Holger Eichelberger and Klaus Schmid. 2015. IVML: A DSL for Configuration in Variability-Rich Software Ecosystems. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Software Product Line (SPLC '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 365–369.
- [16] Holger Eichelberger and Klaus Schmid. 2015. Mapping the Design-Space of Textual Variability Modeling Languages: A Refined Analysis. *International Journal of Software Tools for Technology Transfer* 17, 5 (2015), 559–584.
- [17] Sascha El-Sharkawy, Stephan Dederichs, and Klaus Schmid. 2012. From Feature Models to Decision Models and Back Again: An Analysis Based on Formal Transformations. In *Proc. of the 16th International Software Product Line Conference*. ACM, 126–135.
- [18] Kevin Feichtinger. 2023. A Flexible Approach For Transforming Variability Artifacts. <https://resolver.obvsg.at/urn:nbn:at:at-ubl:1-66213>
- [19] Kevin Feichtinger, Kristof Meixner, Stefan Biffl, and Rick Rabiser. 2022. Evolution Support for Custom Variability Artifacts Using Feature Models: A Study in the Cyber-Physical Production Systems Domain. In *Reuse and Software Quality - 20th International Conference on Software and Systems Reuse, ICSR 2022, Montpellier, France, June 15-17, 2022, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Gilles Perrouin, Naouel Moha, and Abdelhak-Djamel Seriai (Eds.), Vol. 13297. Springer, 79–84. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08129-3\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08129-3_5)
- [20] Kevin Feichtinger, Johann Stöbich, Dario Romano, and Rick Rabiser. 2021. TRAVART: An Approach for Transforming Variability Models. In *15th International Working Conference on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems (VaMoS'21)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 8, 10 pages.
- [21] Kevin Feichtinger, Chico Sundermann, Thomas Thüm, and Rick Rabiser. 2022. It's Your Loss: Classifying Information Loss during Variability Model Roundtrip Transformations. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume A (SPLC '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 67–78.
- [22] Matthias Galster, Danny Weyns, Dan Tofan, Bartosz Michalik, and Paris Avgeriou. 2013. Variability in software systems—a systematic literature review. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 40, 3 (2013), 282–306.
- [23] Hassan Goma. 2005. *Designing software product lines with UML*. IEEE.
- [24] Øystein Haugen, Andrzej Wąsowski, and Krzysztof Czarnecki. 2013. CVL: common variability language. In *Proc. of the 17th International Software Product Line Conference*. ACM, 277–277.
- [25] IVML 2015. *Integrated Variability Modeling Language: Language Specification*. Specification. University of Hildesheim, Hildesheim, DE. [https://projects.sse.uni-hildesheim.de/easy/docs/ivml\\_spec.pdf](https://projects.sse.uni-hildesheim.de/easy/docs/ivml_spec.pdf)
- [26] Kyo C Kang, Sholom G Cohen, James A Hess, William E Novak, and A Spencer Peterson. 1990. *Feature-oriented domain analysis (FODA) feasibility study*. Technical Report. Carnegie-Mellon Univ., Pittsburgh, Pa, Software Engineering Inst.
- [27] Jacob Krüger, Sebastian Nielebock, Sebastian Krieter, Christian Diedrich, Thomas Leich, Gunter Saake, Sebastian Zug, and Frank Ortmeier. 2017. Beyond Software Product Lines: Variability Modeling in Cyber-Physical Systems. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume A (SPLC '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 237–241.
- [28] Jens Meinicke, Thomas Thüm, Reimar Schröter, Fabian Benduhn, Thomas Leich, and Gunter Saake. 2017. *Mastering Software Variability with FeatureIDE*. Springer.
- [29] Kristof Meixner, Kevin Feichtinger, Rick Rabiser, and Stefan Biffl. 2022. Efficient Production Process Variability Exploration. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Working Conference on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems (VaMoS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 14, 9 pages.
- [30] Kristof Meixner, Felix Rinker, Hannes Marcher, Jakob Decker, and Stefan Biffl. 2021. A Domain-Specific Language for Product-Process-Resource Modeling. In *IEEE Int. Conf. on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE.
- [31] Andreas Metzger and Klaus Pohl. 2014. Software product line engineering and variability management: Achievements and challenges. *FOSE*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2593882.2593888>
- [32] Klaus Pohl, Günter Böckle, and Frank J van der Linden. 2005. *Software Product Line Engineering: Foundations, Principles and Techniques*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [33] pure-systems GmbH. 2023. *pure::variants User's Guide*. <https://www.pure-systems.com/fileadmin/downloads/pure-variants/doc/pv-user-manual.pdf> Version 6.0.1.685, last access 2023-04-06.
- [34] Mikko Raatikainen, Juha Tiihonen, and Tomi Männistö. 2019. Software product lines and variability modeling: A tertiary study. *Journal of Systems and Software* 149 (2019), 485–510.
- [35] Dario Romano, Kevin Feichtinger, Danilo Beuche, Uwe Ryssel, and Rick Rabiser. 2022. Bridging the Gap between Academia and Industry: Transforming the Universal Variability Language to pure::variants and Back. In *Proc. of the 5th International Workshop on Languages for Modelling Variability (MODEVAR), co-located with SPLC 2022*. ACM.
- [36] Klaus Schmid, Christian Kröher, and Sascha El-Sharkawy. 2018. Variability Modeling with the Integrated Variability Modeling Language (IVML) and EASy-Producer. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume 1 (SPLC '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 306.
- [37] Klaus Schmid, Rick Rabiser, and Paul Grünbacher. 2011. A comparison of decision modeling approaches in product lines. In *Proc. of the 5th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-Intensive Systems*. ACM, 119–126.
- [38] Pierre-Yves Schobbens, Patrick Heymans, and Jean-Christophe Trigaux. 2006. Feature diagrams: A survey and a formal semantics. In *Proc. of the 14th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference*. IEEE, 139–148.
- [39] Steven She, Rafael Lotufo, Thorsten Berger, Andrzej Wąsowski, and Krzysztof Czarnecki. 2010. The Variability Model of The Linux Kernel. In *Proc. of the 5th International Workshop on Variability Modelling of Software-intensive Systems*. ACM, 45–51.
- [40] Chico Sundermann, Kevin Feichtinger, Dominik Engelhardt, Rick Rabiser, and Thomas Thüm. 2021. Yet Another Textual Variability Language? A Community Effort Towards a Unified Language. In *Proc. of the 25th International Systems and Software Product Line Conference*. ACM, Leicester, United Kingdom.
- [41] Chico Sundermann, Stefan Vill, Thomas Thüm, Kevin Feichtinger, Prankur Agarwal, Rick Rabiser, José A. Galindo, and David Benavides. 2023. UVLParker: Extending UVL with Language Levels and Conversion Strategies. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume B, SPLC 2023, Tokyo, Japan*. ACM, 39–42.
- [42] Thomas Thüm, Christoph Seidl, and Ina Schaefer. 2019. On Language Levels for Feature Modeling Notations. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Systems and Software Product Line Conference - Volume B (SPLC '19)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 158–161.
- [43] Bart Veer and John Dallaway. 2011. *The eCos Component Writer's Guide*. Manual, available online at <http://www.gaisler.com/doc/ecos-2.0-cdl-guide-a4.pdf>.