thoughts on software process

Daniel Jackson
process orderings
local vs global process

global ordering of phases

local ordering of phases
risks
risk-driven development

Risk = Prob(failure) x Cost(failure)

a strategy
› list failures & determine their risks
› devise a strategy to reduce highest risks

sample failures: how would you mitigate?
› performance is unacceptable
› product is unusable because its too complex
› customer changes mind about what product does
› developer solves the wrong problem
› product fails in catastrophic way
› competitor beats you into marketplace
› product has reputation for bugs
› development runs out of time and money
› developers rely on platform that turns out bad
doing design
small design upfront

Agilistas deride “Big Design Upfront” (BDUF)

what about Small Design Upfront?
› what isn’t worth designing?
› can you recover from a bad design?
› what’s the cost of design?

SDUF strategies
› precise but lightweight notations
› separate concerns & focus on risks
› avoid implementation bias
be like a beaver!

small nibbles, big outcome

This image is in the public domain.
intuitive vs data-driven design

When a company is filled with engineers, it turns to engineering to solve problems. Reduce each decision to a simple logic problem. Remove all subjectivity and just look at the data. Data in your favor? OK, launch it. Data shows negative effects? Back to the drawing board. And that data eventually becomes a crutch for every decision, paralyzing the company and preventing it from making any daring design decisions. *Doug Bowman*
Spectrum of Design

Intuition-Driven

Make best-guesses
Rely on previous experience
Study what others are doing
Use best practices, principles & patterns
Aesthetics are integral
Rely on our gut
Creative, visionary
Inherently risky

Data-Driven

Every design choice is tested
Takes others experience with a grain of salt
Design is a logic problem
Rely on data for decision-making
Aesthetics are secondary
Never trust your gut
Cold, calculating
Risk-averse

Doug’s words:

instinctive, subjective, daring

Assumed:

deliberate, objective, safe

from Joshua Porter, bokardo.com
radical design
a TDD guru on sudoku

Sudoku

My plan, subject as always to change, is to code something up in that way that I have, to see what happens. Right now, I'm planning to implement a fairly naive strategy, and a tree-trimming one that I think should solve all problems, albeit perhaps too slowly, and then leave it open to my readers to propose new squares and new heuristic algorithms.

I'm re-ripping my entire CD collection, so I have to sit here anyway. Might as well code something.

The Game

I'm not going to talk much here about the game. There's a square of cells, with side length of n-squared, for order n = 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. You fill in the squares with the integers from 1 to n-squared, subject to the rule that the same integer cannot appear more than once in the same row, same column, or same n-size subsquare as the cell you're filling in. The game begins with some squares "given". Reportedly games come in a range of difficulty. Since I've never played the game, I don't know what makes them more or less difficult. Maybe I'll find out.

Why is This Interesting?

Frankly, I don't know, since I don't play the game. I think that during this exercise we might hit some interesting notions about solving computing problems we couldn't solve by hand, and addressing problems about which we know very little. If nothing else, it may be amusing watching me drown.

Begin With a Test

I'm going to do this in Ruby. My plan is to start with 9 by 9 squares, just because I can, in spite of the fact that I can see already, having thought about it, how to use order to compute a bunch of the items. I'll keep it specific just by way of tempting the YAGNI gods.

My Ruby style uses a project.rb file to map all the files in the app, and various .rb files to contain the tests and classes. My base setup looks like this:

```
project.rb
require 'test/unit'
```

from [http://xprogramming.com/articles/oksudoku/](http://xprogramming.com/articles/oksudoku/)
still going after five long blog posts...

Sudoku 5: Objects Begin to Emerge

The code is beginning to ask for some help. We’re processing a simple array of cells instead of an object, and the classes don’t feel cohesive. Let’s push some methods off to new classes and see what happens.

Peter Norvig solves in one:

Solving Every Sudoku Puzzle

by Peter Norvig

In this essay I tackle the problem of solving every Sudoku puzzle. It turns out to be quite easy (about one page of code for the main idea and two pages for embellishments) using two ideas: constraint propagation and search.

see http://norvig.com/sudoku.html
lessons?

risk
› Ron Jeffries focuses on class design
› but real risk is algorithmic?

Norvig’s advantage
› he knows AI: applies standard solution

Walter Vincenti’s dichotomy
› normal design: tweaking parameters
› radical design: never done this before
co-evolution
co-evolution

problem space

solution space
Image of UML diagrams removed due to copyright restrictions.
Reference: Illustration by Kishorekumar 62 on Wikimedia Commons.
co-evolution in UML
co-evolution in UML

heavy documentation
complex notations
tool support deferred
the cost of complex tools
Manifesto for Agile Software Development

We are uncovering better ways of developing software by doing it and helping others do it. Through this work we have come to value:

- **Individuals and interactions** over processes and tools
- **Working software** over comprehensive documentation
- **Customer collaboration** over contract negotiation
- **Responding to change** over following a plan

That is, while there is value in the items on the right, we value the items on the left more.

- Kent Beck
- Mike Beedle
- Arie van Bennekum
- Alistair Cockburn
- Ward Cunningham
- Martin Fowler
- James Grenning
- Jim Highsmith
- Andrew Hunt
- Ron Jeffries
- Jon Kern
- Brian Marick
- Robert C. Martin
- Steve Mellor
- Ken Schwaber
- Jeff Sutherland
- Dave Thomas

© the above authors. All rights reserved. This content is excluded from our Creative Commons license. For more information, see http://ocw.mit.edu/fairuse.
co-evolution in agile
co-evolution in agile

baby out with bathwater
today's orthodoxy?
unused
descartes’s four rules

The first was never to accept anything for true which I did not clearly know to be such; that is to say, carefully to avoid precipitancy and prejudice, and to comprise nothing more in my judgment than what was presented to my mind so clearly and distinctly as to exclude all ground of doubt.

The second, to divide each of the difficulties under examination into as many parts as possible, and as might be necessary for its adequate solution.

The third, to conduct my thoughts in such order that, by commencing with objects the simplest and easiest to know, I might ascend by little and little, and, as it were, step by step, to the knowledge of the more complex; assigning in thought a certain order even to those objects which in their own nature do not stand in a relation of antecedence and sequence.

And the last, in every case to make enumerations so complete, and reviews so general, that I might be assured that nothing was omitted.
“This rule of Descartes is of little use as long as the art of dividing remains unexplained... By dividing his problem into unsuitable parts, the inexperienced problem-solver may increase his difficulty.”

norvig on sudoku
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