UNIT – II

Conventional Software Management: The waterfall model, conventional software Management performance.

Evolution of Software Economics: Software Economics, pragmatic software cost estimation.

Improving Software Economics: Reducing Software product size, improving software processes,

improving teameffectiveness, improving automation, Achieving required quality, peer inspections.

1. Conventional software management

Conventional software management practices are sound in theory, but practice is still tied to archaic (outdated)technology and techniques.

Conventional software economics provides a benchmark of performance for conventional software manage-ment principles.

The **best** thing about software is its **flexibility**: It can be programmed to do almost anything.

The **worst** thing about software is also its **flexibility**: The "almost anything" characteristic has made it difficultto plan, monitors, and control software development.

Three important analyses of the state of the software engineering industry are

1. Software development is still highly unpredictable. Only about **10%** of software projects aredelivered **successfully** within initial budget and schedule estimates.
2. Management discipline is more of a discriminator in success or failure than are technology advances.
3. The level of software scrap and rework is indicative of an immature process.

All three analyses reached the same general conclusion: The success rate for software projects is very low. The three analyses provide a good introduction to the magnitude of the software problem and the current norms for conventional software management performance.

THE WATERFALL MODEL

Most software engineering texts present the waterfall model as the source of the "conventional" software process.

IN THEORY

It provides an insightful and concise summary of conventional software managementThree main primary points are

1. There are two essential steps common to the development of computer programs: **analysis** and **coding.**

   Waterfall Model part 1: The two basic steps to building a program.

Analysis and coding both involve creative work that directly contributes to the usefulness of the end product.

2. In order to manage and control all of the intellectual freedom associated with software development, one must introduce several other "overhead" steps, including system requirements definition, software requirements definition, program design, and testing. These steps supplement the analysis and coding steps. Below Figure illustrates the resulting project profile and the basic steps in developing a large-scale program.

3. The basic framework described in the waterfall model is risky and invites failure. The testing phase that occurs at the end of the development cycle is the first event for which timing, storage, input/output transfers, etc., are experienced as distinguished from analyzed. The resulting design changes are likely to be so disruptive that the software requirements upon which the design is based are likely violated. Either the requirements must be modified or a substantial design change is warranted.

Five necessary improvements for waterfall model are:-

1. **Program design comes first**. Insert a preliminary program design phase between the software requirements generation phase and the analysis phase. **By this technique, the program designer assures that the software will not fail because of storage, timing, and data flux (continuous change).** As analysis proceeds in the succeeding phase, the program designer must impose on the analyst the storage, timing, and operational constraints in such a way that he senses the consequences. If the total resources to be applied are insufficient or if the embryonic(in an early stage of development) operational design is wrong, it will be recognized at this early stage and the iteration with requirements and preliminary design can be redone before final design, coding, and test commences. How is this program design procedure implemented?

   The following steps are required:
   Begin the design process with program **designers**, not analysts or programmers.
   Design, define, and allocate the data processing modes even at the risk of being wrong. Allocate processing functions, design the database, allocate execution time, define interfaces and processing modes with the operating system, describe input and output processing, and define preliminary operating procedures.
   Write an overview document that is understandable, informative, and current so that every worker on the project can gain an elemental understanding of the system.

2. **Document the design**. The amount of documentation required on most software programs is quite a lot, certainly much more than most programmers, analysts, or program designers are willing to do if left to their own devices. Why do we need so much documentation? (**1**) Each designer must communicate with interfacing designers, managers, and possibly customers. (**2**) During early phases, the documentation is the design. (3) The real monetary value of documentation is to support later modifications by a separate test team, a separate maintenance team, and operations personnel who are not software literate.

3. **Do it twice.** If a computer program is being developed for the first time, arrange matters so that the version finally delivered to the customer for operational deployment is actually the second version insofar as critical design/operations are concerned. Note that this is simply the entire process done in miniature, to a time scale

that is relatively small with respect to the overall effort. In the first version, the team must have a special broad competence where they can quickly sense trouble spots in the design, model them, model alternatives, forget the straightforward aspects of the design that aren't worth studying at this early point, and, finally, arrive at an error-free program.

4. Plan, control, and monitor testing. Without question, the biggest user of project resources-manpower, computer time, and/or management judgment-is the test phase. This is the phase of greatest risk in terms of cost and schedule. It occurs at the latest point in the schedule, when backup alternatives are least available, if at all. The previous three recommendations were all aimed at uncovering and solving problems before entering the test phase. However, even after doing these things, there is still a test phase and there are still important things to be done, including: (1) employ a team of test specialists who were not responsible for the original design; (2) employ visual inspections to spot the obvious errors like dropped minus signs, missing factors of two, jumps to wrong addresses (do not use the computer to detect this kind of thing, it is too expensive); (3) test every logic path; (4) employ the final checkout on the target computer.

5. Involve the customer. It is important to involve the customer in a formal way so that he has committed himself at earlier points before final delivery. There are three points following requirements definition where the insight, judgment, and commitment of the customer can bolster the development effort. These include a "preliminary software review" following the preliminary program design step, a sequence of "critical software design reviews" during program design, and a "final software acceptance review".

IN PRACTICE

Some software projects still practice the conventional software management approach.

It is useful to summarize the characteristics of the conventional process as it has typically been applied, which is not necessarily as it was intended. Projects destined for trouble frequently exhibit the following symptoms:

- Protracted integration and late design breakage.
- Late risk resolution.
- Requirements-driven functional decomposition.
- Adversarial (conflict or opposition) stakeholder relationships.
- Focus on documents and review meetings.

Protracted Integration and Late Design Breakage

For a typical development project that used a waterfall model management process, Figure 1-2 illustrates development progress versus time. Progress is defined as percent coded, that is, demonstrable in its target form.

The following sequence was common:

- Early success via paper designs and thorough (often *too* thorough) briefings.
- Commitment to code late in the life cycle.
- Integration nightmares (unpleasant experience) due to unforeseen implementation issues and interface ambiguities.
- Heavy budget and schedule pressure to get the system working.
- Late shoe-homing of no optimal fixes, with no time for redesign.
- A very fragile, unmentionable product delivered late.

Format	Ad hoc text	Flowcharts	Source code	Configuration baselines
Activity	Requirements analysis	Program design	Coding and unit testing	Protracted integration and testing
Product	Documents	Documents	Coded units	Fragile baselines

FIGURE 1-2. *Progress profile of a conventional software project*

In the conventional model, the entire system was designed on paper, then implemented all at once, then
integrated. Table 1-1 provides a typical profile of cost expenditures across the spectrum of software activities.

**TABLE 1-1.** *Expenditures by activity for a conventional software project*

ACTIVITY	COST
Management	5%
Requirements	5%
Design	10%
Code and unit testing	30%
Integration and test	40%
Deployment	5%
Environment	5%
Total	100%

Late risk resolution A serious issue associated with the waterfall lifecycle was the lack of early risk resolution. Figure 1.3 illustrates a typical risk profile for conventional waterfall model projects. It includes four distinct periods of risk exposure, where risk is defined as the probability of missing a cost, schedule, feature, or quality goal. Early in the life cycle, as the requirements were being specified, the actual risk exposure was highly unpredictable.

Requirements-Driven Functional Decomposition: This approach depends on specifying requirements com- pletely and unambiguously before other development activities begin. It naively treats all requirements as equally important, and depends on those requirements remaining constant over the software development life cycle. These conditions rarely occur in the real world. Specification of requirements is a difficult and important part of the software development process.

Another property of the conventional approach is that the requirements were typically specified in a functional manner. Built into the classic waterfall process was the fundamental assumption that the software itself was decomposed into functions; requirements were then allocated to the resulting components. This decomposition was often very different from a decomposition based on object-oriented design and the use of existing components. Figure 1-4 illustrates the result of requirements-driven approaches: a software structure that is organized around the requirements specification structure.

FIGURE 1-4. *Suboptimal software component organization resulting from a requirements-driven approach*

Adversarial Stakeholder Relationships:

The conventional process tended to result in adversarial stakeholder relationships, in large part because of the difficulties of requirements specification and the exchange of information solely through paper documents that captured engineering information in ad hoc formats.

The following sequence of events was typical for most contractual software efforts:
1. The contractor prepared a draft contract-deliverable document that captured an intermediate artifactand delivered it to the customer for approval.

2. The customer was expected to provide comments (typically within 15 to 30 days).

3. The contractor incorporated these comments and submitted (typically within 15 to 30 days) a finalversion for approval.

This one-shot review process encouraged high levels of sensitivity on the part of customers and contractors.

Focus on Documents and Review Meetings:
The conventional process focused on producing various documents that attempted to describe the software product, with insufficient focus on producing tangible increments of the products themselves. Contractors were driven to produce literally tons of paper to meet milestones and demonstrate progress to stakeholders, rather than spend their energy on tasks that would reduce risk and produce quality software. Typically, presenters and the audience reviewed the simple things that they understood rather than the complex and important issues. Most design reviews therefore resulted in low engineering value and high cost in terms of the effort and schedule involved in their preparation and conduct. They presented merely a facade of progress.

Table 1-2 summarizes the results of a typical design review.

TABLE 1-2.   *Results of conventional software project design reviews*

APPARENT RESULTS	REAL RESULTS
Big-briefing to a diverse audience	Only a small percentage of the audience understands the software.
	Briefings and documents expose few of the important assets and risks of complex software systems.
A design that appears to be compliant	There is no tangible evidence of compliance.
	Compliance with ambiguous requirements is of little value.
Coverage of requirements (typically hundreds)	Few (tens) are design drivers.
	Dealing with all requirements dilutes the focus on the critical drivers.
A design considered "innocent until proven guilty"	The design is always guilty.
	Design flaws are exposed later in the life cycle.

CONVENTIONAL SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE

Barry Boehm's "Industrial Software Metrics **Top 10** List" is a good, objective characterization of the state ofsoftware development.
1. Finding and fixing a software problem after delivery **costs 100** times more than finding and fixing theproblem in early design phases.
2. You can compress software development schedules **25%** of nominal, but no more.
3. For every **$1** you spend on development, you will spend **$2** on maintenance.
4. Software development and maintenance costs are primarily a function of the number of source linesof code.
5. Variations among people account for the **biggest** differences in software productivity.
6. The overall ratio of software to hardware costs is still growing. In 1955 it was **15:85**; in 1985, **85:15**.
7. Only about **15**% of software development effort is devoted to programming.
8. Software systems and products typically cost 3 times as much per SLOC as individual softwareprograms. Software-system products (i.e., system of systems) cost 9 times as much.
9. Walkthroughs catch **60**% of the errors
10. **80**% of the contribution comes from **20**% of the contributors.

2. Evolution of Software Economics

SOFTWARE ECONOMICS

Most software cost models can be abstracted into a function of five basic parameters: **size, process, personnel, environment, and required quality.**

1. The *size* of the end product (in human-generated components), which is typically quantified in terms of the number of source instructions or the number of function points required to develop the required functionality
2. The *process* used to produce the end product, in particular the ability of the process to avoid non- value-adding activities (rework, bureaucratic delays, communications overhead)
3. The capabilities of software engineering *personnel,* and particularly their experience with the computer science issues and the applications domain issues of the project
4. The *environment,* which is made up of the tools and techniques available to support efficient software development and to automate the process
5. The required *quality* of the product, including its features, performance, reliability,

   and adaptability The relationships among these parameters and the estimated cost can

   be written as follows:

$$\text{Effort} = (\text{Personnel})\ (\text{Environment})\ (\text{Quality})\ (\ \text{Size}^{\text{process}})$$

One important aspect of software economics (as represented within today's software cost models) is that the relationship between effort and size exhibits a diseconomy of scale. The diseconomy of scale of software development is a result of the process exponent being greater than 1.0. Contrary to most manufacturing processes, the more software you build, the more expensive it is per unit item.

Figure 2-1 shows three generations of basic technology advancement in tools, components, and processes. The required levels of quality and personnel are assumed to be constant. The ordinate of the graph refers to software unit costs (pick your favorite: per SLOC, per function point, per component) realized by an organization.

The three generations of software development are defined as follows:

1) *Conventional:* 1960s and 1970s, craftsmanship. Organizations used custom tools, custom processes, and virtually all custom components built in primitive languages. Project performance was highly predictable in that cost, schedule, and quality objectives were almost always underachieved.
2) *Transition:* 1980s and 1990s, software engineering. Organiz:1tions used more-repeatable processes and off- the-shelf tools, and mostly (>70%) custom components built in higher level languages. Some of the components (<30%) were available as commercial products, including the operating system, database management system, networking, and graphical user interface.
3) *Modern practices:* 2000 and later, software production. This book's philosophy is rooted in the use of managed and measured processes, integrated automation environments, and mostly (70%) off-the-shelf components. Perhaps as few as 30% of the components need to be custom built

Technologies for environment automation, size reduction, and process improvement are not independent of one another. In each new era, the key is complementary growth in all technologies. For example, the process advances could not be used successfully without new component technologies and increased tool automation.

Target objective: improved ROI

| Software ROI |

Cost (y-axis) vs Software Size (x-axis)

- 1960s–1970s	- 1980s–1990s	- 2000 and on
- Waterfall model	- Process impovement	- Iterative development
- Functional design	- Encapsulation-based	- Component-based
- Diseconomy of scale	- Diseconomy of scale	- Return on investment

Corresponding environment, size, and process technologies

Conventional	Transition	Modern Practices
Environments/tools:	**Environment/tools:**	**Environment/tools:**
Custom	Off-the-shelf, separate	Off-the-shelf, integrated
Size:	**Size:**	**Size:**
100% custom	30% component-based	70% component-based
	70% custom	30% custom
Process:	**Process:**	**Process:**
Ad hoc	Repeatable	Managed/measured

Typical project performance

Predictably bad	Unpredictable	Predictable
Always:	Infrequently:	Usually:
Over budget	On budget	On budget
Over schedule	On schedule	On schedule

FIGURE 2-1. *Three generations of software economics leading to the target objective*

Organizations are achieving better economies of scale in successive technology eras-with very large projects (systems of systems), long-lived products, and lines of business comprising multiple similar projects. Figure 2-2 provides an overview of how a return on investment (ROI) profile can be achieved in subsequent efforts across life cycles of various domains.

FIGURE 2-2. *Return on investment in different domains*

PRAGMATIC SOFTWARE COST ESTIMATION

One critical problem in software cost estimation is a lack of well-documented case studies of projects that used an iterative development approach. Software industry has inconsistently defined metrics or atomic units of measure, the data from actual projects are highly suspect in terms of consistency and comparability. It is hard enough to collect a homogeneous set of project data within one organization; it is extremely difficult to homog- enize data across different organizations with different processes, languages, domains, and so on.

There have been many debates among developers and vendors of software cost estimation models and tools. Three topics of these debates are of particular interest here:

1. Which cost estimation model to use?
2. Whether to measure software size in source lines of code or function points.
3. What constitutes a good estimate?

There are several popular cost estimation models (such as COCOMO, CHECKPOINT, ESTIMACS, Knowledge Plan, Price-S, ProQMS, SEER, SLIM, SOFTCOST, and SPQR/20), CO COMO is also one of the

most open and well-documented cost estimation models. The general accuracy of conventional cost models (such as COCOMO) has been described as "within 20% of actuals, 70% of the time."

Most real-world use of cost models is bottom-up (substantiating a target cost) rather than top-down (estimating the "should" cost). Figure 2-3 illustrates the predominant practice: The software project manager defines the target cost of the software, and then manipulates the parameters and sizing until the target cost can be justified. The rationale for the target cost maybe *to* win a proposal, to solicit customer funding, to attain internal corporate funding, or to achieve some other goal.

The process described in Figure 2-3 is not all bad. In fact, it is absolutely necessary to analyze the cost risks and understand the sensitivities and trade-offs objectively. It forces the software project manager to examine the risks associated with achieving the target costs and to discuss this information with other stakeholders.

A good software cost estimate has the following attributes:

- It is conceived and supported by the project manager, architecture team, development team, and testteam accountable for performing the work.

- It is accepted by all stakeholders as ambitious but realizable.

- It is based on a well-defined software cost model with a credible basis.

- It is based on a database of relevant project experience that includes similar processes, similartechnologies, similar environments, similar quality requirements, and similar people.

- It is defined in enough detail so that its key risk areas are understood and the probability of success isobjectively assessed.

Extrapolating from a good estimate, an *ideal* estimate would be derived from a mature cost model with an experience base that reflects multiple similar projects done by the same team with the same mature processes and tools.

FIGURE 2-3. *The predominant cost estimation process*

3. Improving Software Economics

Five basic parameters of the software cost model are

1. Reducing the *size* or complexity of what needs to be developed.

2. Improving the development *process.*

3. Using more-skilled *personnel* and better teams (not necessarily the same thing).

4. Using better *environments* (tools to automate the process).

5. Trading off or backing off on *quality* thresholds.

These parameters are given in priority order for most software domains. Table 3-1 lists some of the technology developments, process improvement efforts, and management approaches targeted at improving the economics of software development and integration.

TABLE 3-1. *Important trends in improving software economics*

COST MODEL PARAMETERS	TRENDS
Size Abstraction and component-based development technologies	Higher order languages (C++, Ada 95, Java, Visual Basic, etc.) Object-oriented (analysis, design, programming) Reuse Commercial components
Process Methods and techniques	Iterative development Process maturity models Architecture-first development Acquisition reform
Personnel People factors	Training and personnel skill development Teamwork Win-win cultures
Environment Automation technologies and tools	Integrated tools (visual modeling, compiler, editor, debugger, change management, etc.) Open systems Hardware platform performance Automation of coding, documents, testing, analyses
Quality Performance, reliability, accuracy	Hardware platform performance Demonstration-based assessment Statistical quality control

REDUCING SOFTWARE PRODUCT SIZE

The most significant way to improve affordability and return on investment (ROI) is usually to produce a product that achieves the design goals with the minimum amount of human-generated source material. *Component-based development* is introduced as the general term for reducing the "**source**" language size to achieve a software solution.

Reuse, object-oriented technology, automatic code production, and higher order programming languages are all focused on achieving a given system with fewer lines of human-specified source directives (statements).

size reduction is the primary motivation behind improvements in higher order languages (such as C++, Ada 95, Java, Visual Basic), automatic code generators (CASE tools, visual modeling tools, GUI builders), reuse of **commercial components** (operating systems, windowing environments, database management systems, middleware, networks), and object-oriented technologies (Unified Modeling Language, visual modeling tools, architecture frameworks).

The reduction is defined in terms of human-generated source material. In general, when size-reducing technologies are used, they reduce the number of human-generated source lines.

LANGUAGES

Universal function points (UFPs[1]) are useful estimators for language-independent, early life-cycle estimates. The basic units of function points are external user inputs, external outputs, internal logical data groups, external data interfaces, and external inquiries. SLOC metrics are useful estimators for software after a candidate solution is formulated and an implementation language is known. Substantial data have been documented relating SLOC to function points. Some of these results are shown in Table 3-2.

Languages expressiveness of some of today's popular languages

LANGUAGES	SLOC per UFP
Assembly	320
C	128
FORTAN77	105
COBOL85	91
Ada83	71
C++	56
Ada95	55
Java	55
Visual Basic	35

Table 3-2

OBJECT-ORIENTED METHODS AND VISUAL MODELING

Object-oriented technology is not germane to most of the software management topics discussed here, and books on object-oriented technology abound. Object-oriented programming languages appear to benefit both software productivity and software quality. The fundamental impact of object-oriented technology is in reducing the overall size of what needs to be developed.

People like drawing pictures to explain something to others or to themselves. When they do it for software system design, they call these pictures diagrams or diagrammatic models and the very notation for them a modeling language.

These are interesting examples of the interrelationships among the dimensions of improving software eco- nomics.

1. An object-oriented model of the problem and its solution encourages a common vocabulary between the end users of a system and its developers, thus creating a shared understanding of the problem being solved.

2. The use of continuous integration creates opportunities to recognize risk early and make incremental corrections without destabilizing the entire development effort.

3. An object-oriented architecture provides a clear separation of concerns among disparate elements of a system, creating firewalls that prevent a change in one part of the system from rending the fabric of the entire architecture.

---

[1] Function point metrics provide a standardized method for measuring the various functions of a software application.

The basic units of function points are external user inputs, external outputs, internal logical data groups, external data interfaces, and external inquiries.

Booch also summarized five characteristics of a successful object-oriented project.

1. A ruthless focus on the development of a system that provides a well understood collection of essentialminimal characteristics.
2. The existence of a culture that is centered on results, encourages communication, and yet is not afraidto fail.
3. The effective use of object-oriented modeling.
4. The existence of a strong architectural vision.
5. The application of a well-managed iterative and incremental development life cycle.

REUSE

Reusing existing components and building reusable components have been natural software engineering activities since the earliest improvements in programming languages. With reuse in order to minimize development costs while achieving all the other required attributes of performance, feature set, and quality. Try to treat reuse as a mundane part of achieving a return on investment.

Most truly reusable components of value are transitioned to commercial products supported by organizations with the following characteristics:

- They have an economic motivation for continued support.
- They take ownership of improving product quality, adding new features, and transitioning to newtechnologies.
- They have a sufficiently broad customer base to be profitable.

The cost of developing a reusable component is not trivial. Figure 3-1 examines the economic trade-offs. Thesteep initial curve illustrates the economic obstacle to developing reusable components.

Reuse is an important discipline that has an impact on the efficiency of all workflows and the quality of mostartifacts.

Many-project solution: Operating with high value per unit investment, typical of commercial products

5 project solution: 125% more cost and 150% more time

2 project solution: 50% more cost and 100% more time

1 project solution: $N and M months

Development Cost and Schedule Resources

Number of Projects Using Reusable Components

FIGURE 3-1. Cost and schedule investments necessary to achieve reusable components

COMMERCIAL COMPONENTS

A common approach being pursued today in many domains is to maximize integration of commercial components and off-the-shelf products. While the use of commercial components is certainly desirable as a means of reducing custom development, it has not proven to be straightforward in practice. Table 3-3 identifies some of the advantages and disadvantages of using commercial components.

TABLE 3-3. *Advantages and disadvantages of commercial components versus custom software*

APPROACH	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Commercial components	Predictable license costs	Frequent upgrades
	Broadly used, mature technology	Up-front license fees
	Available now	Recurring maintenance fees
	Dedicated support organization	Dependency on vendor
	Hardware/software independence	Run-time efficiency sacrifices
	Rich in functionality	Functionality constraints
		Integration not always trivial
		No control over upgrades and maintenance
		Unnecessary features that consume extra resources
		Often inadequate reliability and stability
		Multiple-vendor incompatibilities
Custom development	Complete change freedom	Expensive, unpredictable development
	Smaller, often simpler implementations	Unpredictable availability date
		Undefined maintenance model
	Often better performance	Often immature and fragile
	Control of development and enhancement	Single-platform dependency
		Drain on expert resources

IMPROVING SOFTWARE PROCESSES

Process is an overloaded term. Three distinct process perspectives are.

- *Metaprocess:* an organization's policies, procedures, and practices for pursuing a software-intensive line of business. The focus of this process is on organizational economics, long-term strategies, and software ROI.

- *Macroprocess:* a project's policies, procedures, and practices for producing a complete software product within certain cost, schedule, and quality constraints. The focus of the macro process is on creating an adequate instance of the Meta process for a specific set of constraints.

- *Microprocess:* a project team's policies, procedures, and practices for achieving an artifact of the software process. The focus of the micro process is on achieving an intermediate product baseline with adequate quality and adequate functionality as economically and rapidly as practical.

Although these three levels of process overlap somewhat, they have different objectives, audiences, metrics, concerns, and time scales as shown in Table 3-4

TABLE 3-4. *Three levels of process and their attributes*

ATTRIBUTES	METAPROCESS	MACROPROCESS	MICROPROCESS
Subject	Line of business	Project	Iteration
Objectives	Line-of-business profitability	Project profitability	Resource management
	Competitiveness	Risk management	Risk resolution
		Project budget, schedule, quality	Milestone budget, schedule, quality
Audience	Acquisition authorities, customers	Software project managers	Subproject managers
	Organizational management	Software engineers	Software engineers
Metrics	Project predictability	On budget, on schedule	On budget, on schedule
	Revenue, market share	Major milestone success	Major milestone progress
		Project scrap and rework	Release/iteration scrap and rework
Concerns	Bureaucracy vs. standardization	Quality vs. financial performance	Content vs. schedule
Time scales	6 to 12 months	1 to many years	1 to 6 months

In a perfect software engineering world with an immaculate problem description, an obvious solution space, a development team of experienced geniuses, adequate resources, and stakeholders with common goals, we could execute a software development process in one iteration with almost no scrap and rework. Because we work in an imperfect world, however, we need to manage engineering activities so that scrap and rework profiles do not have an impact on the win conditions of any stakeholder. This should be the underlying premise for most process improvements.

IMPROVING TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

Teamwork is much more important than the sum of the individuals. With software teams, a project manager needs to configure a balance of solid talent with highly skilled people in the leverage positions. Some maxims of team management include the following:

- A well-managed project can succeed with a nominal engineering team.
- A mismanaged project will almost never succeed, even with an expert team of engineers.
- A well-architected system can be built by a nominal team of software builders.
- A poorly architected system will flounder even with an expert team of builders.

Boehm five staffing principles are
1. The principle of top talent: Use better and fewer people
2. The principle of job matching: Fit the tasks to the skills and motivation of the people available.
3. The principle of career progression: An organization does best in the long run by helping its peopleto **self-actualize**.
4. The principle of team balance: Select people who will complement and harmonize with one another
5. The principle of phase-out: Keeping a misfit on the team doesn't benefit anyone

Software project managers need many leadership qualities in order to enhance team effectiveness. The following are some crucial attributes of successful software project managers that deserve much more attention:

1. **Hiring skills**. Few decisions are as important as hiring decisions. Placing the right person in the right job seems obvious but is surprisingly hard to achieve.
2. **Customer-interface skill**. Avoiding adversarial relationships among stakeholders is a prerequisite forsuccess.

Decision-making skill. The jillion books written about management have failed to provide a clear definition of this attribute. We all know a good leader when we run into one, and decision-making skill seems obvious despite its intangible definition.

Team-building skill. Teamwork requires that a manager establish trust, motivate progress, exploit eccentric prima donnas, transition average people into top performers, eliminate misfits, and consolidate diverse opinions into a team direction.

Selling skill. Successful project managers must sell all stakeholders (including themselves) on decisions and priorities, sell candidates on job positions, sell changes to the status quo in the face of resistance, and sell achievements against objectives. In practice, selling requires continuous negotiation, compromise, and empathy

IMPROVING AUTOMATION THROUGH SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENTS

The tools and environment used in the software process generally have a linear effect on the productivity of the process. Planning tools, requirements management tools, visual modeling tools, compilers, editors, debuggers, quality assurance analysis tools, test tools, and user interfaces provide crucial automation support for evolving the software engineering artifacts. Above all, configuration management environments provide the foundation for executing and instrument the process. At first order, the isolated impact of tools and automation generally allows improvements of 20% to 40% in effort. However, tools and environments must be viewed as the primary delivery vehicle for process automation and improvement, so their impact can be much higher.

Automation of the design process provides payback in quality, the ability to estimate costs and schedules, and overall productivity using a smaller team.
Round-trip engineering describes the key capability of environments that support iterative development. As we have moved into maintaining different information repositories for the engineering artifacts, we need automation support to ensure efficient and error-free transition of data from one artifact to another. *Forward engineering* is the automation of one engineering artifact from another, more abstract representation. For example, compilers and linkers have provided automated transition of source code into executable code.
Reverse engineering is the generation or modification of a more abstract representation from an existing artifact(for example, creating a visual design model from a source code representation). Economic improvements associated with tools and environments. It is common for tool vendors to make rela- tively accurate individual assessments of life-cycle activities to support claims about the potential economic impact of their tools. For example, it is easy to find statements such as the following from companies in a particular tool.
- Requirements analysis and evolution activities consume 40% of life-cycle costs.
- Software design activities have an impact on more than 50% of the resources.
- Coding and unit testing activities consume about 50% of software development effort and schedule.

- Test activities can consume as much as 50% of a project's resources.
- Configuration control and change management are critical activities that can consume as much as 25% of resources on a large-scale project.
- Documentation activities can consume more than 30% of project engineering resources.
- Project management, business administration, and progress assessment can consume as much as 30% of project budgets.

ACHIEVING REQUIRED QUALITY

Software best practices are derived from the development process and technologies. Table 3-5 summarizes some dimensions of quality improvement.

Key practices that improve overall software quality include the following:

- Focusing on driving requirements and critical use cases early in the life cycle, focusing on requirements completeness and traceability late in the life cycle, and focusing throughout the life cycle on a balance between requirements evolution, design evolution, and plan evolution

- Using metrics and indicators to measure the progress and quality of an architecture as it evolves from a high-level prototype into a fully compliant product

- Providing integrated life-cycle environments that support early and continuous configuration control, change management, rigorous design methods, document automation, and regression test automation

- Using visual modeling and higher level languages that support architectural control, abstraction, reliable programming, reuse, and self-documentation

- Early and continuous insight into performance issues through demonstration-based evaluations

TABLE 3-5.   General quality improvements with a modern process

QUALITY DRIVER	CONVENTIONAL PROCESS	MODERN ITERATIVE PROCESSES
Requirements misunderstanding	Discovered late	Resolved early
Development risk	Unknown until late	Understood and resolved early
Commercial components	Mostly unavailable	Still a quality driver, but trade-offs must be resolved early in the life cycle
Change management	Late in the life cycle, chaotic and malignant	Early in the life cycle, straight-forward and benign
Design errors	Discovered late	Resolved early
Automation	Mostly error-prone manual procedures	Mostly automated, error-free evolution of artifacts
Resource adequacy	Unpredictable	Predictable
Schedules	Overconstrained	Tunable to quality, performance, and technology
Target performance	Paper-based analysis or separate simulation	Executing prototypes, early performance feedback, quantitative understanding
Software process rigor	Document-based	Managed, measured, and tool-supported

Conventional development processes stressed early sizing and timing estimates of computer program resource utilization. However, the typical chronology of events in performance assessment was as follows

- ☐ Project inception. The proposed design was asserted to be low risk with adequate performance margin.

- ☐ Initial design review. Optimistic assessments of adequate design margin were based mostly on paper analysis or rough simulation of the critical threads. In most cases, the actual application algorithms and database sizes were fairly well understood.

- ☐ Mid-life-cycle design review. The assessments started whittling away at the margin, as early benchmarks and initial tests began exposing the optimism inherent in earlier estimates.

- ☐ Integration and test. Serious performance problems were uncovered, necessitating fundamental changes in the architecture. The underlying infrastructure was usually the scapegoat, but the real culprit was immature use of the infrastructure, immature architectural solutions, or poorly understood early design trade-offs.

PEER INSPECTIONS: A PRAGMATICVIEW

Peer inspections are frequently over hyped as the key aspect of a quality system. In my experience, peer reviews are valuable as secondary mechanisms, but they are rarely significant contributors to quality compared with the following primary quality mechanisms and indicators, which should be emphasized in the management process:

- ☐ Transitioning engineering information from one artifact set to another, thereby assessing the consistency, feasibility, understandability, and technology constraints inherent in the engineering artifacts

- ☐ Major milestone demonstrations that force the artifacts to be assessed against tangible criteria in the context of relevant use cases

- ☐ Environment tools (compilers, debuggers, analyzers, automated test suites) that ensure representation rigor, consistency, completeness, and change control

- ☐ Life-cycle testing for detailed insight into critical trade-offs, acceptance criteria, and requirements compliance

- ☐ Change management metrics for objective insight into multiple-perspective change trends and convergence or divergence from quality and progress goals

Inspections are also a good vehicle for holding authors accountable for quality products.

All authors of software and documentation should have their products scrutinized as a

natural by-product of the process. Therefore, the coverage of inspections should be

across all authors rather than across all components.

Conventional and Modern Software Management: The principles of conventional software Engineering,principles of modern software management, transitioning to an iterative process.

Life cycle phases: Engineering and Production stages, Inception, Elaboration, Construction, Transition Phases.

4. CONVENTIONAL AND MODERN SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT
THE PRINCIPLES OF CONVENTIONAL SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

1. **Make quality** Quality must be quantified and mechanisms put into place to motivate its achievement

2. **High-quality software is possible**. Techniques that have been demonstrated to increase quality include involving the customer, prototyping, simplifying design, conducting inspections, and hiring the best people

3. **Give products to customers early**. No matter how hard you try to learn users' needs during the requirements phase, the most effective way to determine real needs is to give users a product and let them play with it 4.**Determine the problem before writing the requirements**. When faced with what they believe is a problem, most engineers rush to offer a solution. Before you try to solve a problem, be sure to explore all the alternatives and don't be blinded by the obvious solution

5. **Evaluate design alternatives**. After the requirements are agreed upon, you must examine a variety of architectures and algorithms. You certainly do not want to use" architecture" simply because it was used in the requirements specification.

6. **Use an appropriate process model**. Each project must select a process that makes ·the most sense for that project on the basis of corporate culture, willingness to take risks, application area, volatility of requirements, and the extent to which requirements are well understood.

7. **Use different languages for different phases**. Our industry's eternal thirst for simple solutions to complex problems has driven many to declare that the best development method is one that uses the same notation through-out the life cycle.

8. **Minimize intellectual distance**. To minimize intellectual distance, the software's structure should be as close as possible to the real-world structure

9. **Put techniques before tools**. An undisciplined software engineer with a tool becomes a dangerous, undisciplined software engineer

10. **Get it right before you make it faster**. It is far easier to make a working program run faster than it is to make a fast program work. Don't worry about optimization during initial coding

11. **Inspect code**. Inspecting the detailed design and code is a much better way to find errors than testing

12. **Good management is more important than good technology**. Good management motivates people to do their best, but there are no universal "right" styles of management.

13. **People are the key to success.** Highly skilled people with appropriate experience, talent, and training are key. 14. **Follow with care**. Just because everybody is doing something does not make it right for you. It may be right, but you must carefully assess its applicability to your environment.

15. **Take responsibility**. When a bridge collapses we ask, "What did the engineers do wrong?" Even when software fails, we rarely ask this. The fact is that in any engineering discipline, the best methods can be used to produce awful designs, and the most antiquated methods to produce elegant designs.

16. **Understand the customer's priorities**. It is possible the customer would tolerate 90% of the functionality delivered late if they could have 10% of it on time.

17. **The more they see, the more they need**. The more functionality (or performance) you provide a user, the more functionality (or performance) the user wants.

18. **Plan to throw one away**. One of the most important critical success factors is whether or not a product is entirely new. Such brand-new applications, architectures, interfaces, or algorithms rarely work the first time.

19. **Design for change**. The architectures, components, and specification techniques you use must accommodate change.

20. **Design without documentation is not design**. I have often heard software engineers say, "I have finished the design. All that is left is the documentation. "

21. **Use tools, but be realistic.** Software tools make their users more efficient.

22. **Avoid tricks**. Many programmers love to create programs with tricks constructs that perform a function correctly, but in an obscure way. Show the world how smart you are by avoiding tricky code

23. **Encapsulate.** Information-hiding is a simple, proven concept that results in software that is easier to test and much easier to maintain.

24. **Use coupling and cohesion**. Coupling and cohesion are the best ways to measure software's inherent maintainability and adaptability

25. **Use the McCabe complexity measure**. Although there are many metrics available to report the inherent complexity of software, none is as intuitive and easy to use as Tom McCabe's

26. **Don't test your own software**. Software developers should never be the primary testers of their own software.

27. **Analyze causes for errors**. It is far more cost-effective to reduce the effect of an error by preventing it than it is to find and fix it. One way to do this is to analyze the causes of errors as they are detected

28. **Realize that software's entropy increases**. Any software system that undergoes continuous change will grow in complexity and will become more and more disorganized

29. **People and time are not interchangeable**. Measuring a project solely by person-

THE PRINCIPLES OF MODERN SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT

Top 10 principles of modern software management are. (The first five, which are the main themes of my definition of aniterative process, are summarized in Figure 4-1.)

1. **Base the process on an *architecture-first approach.*** This requires that a demonstrable balance be achieved among the driving requirements, the architecturally significant design decisions, and the life- cycle plans before the resources are committed for full-scale development.

2. **Establish an *iterative life-cycle process* that confronts risk early**. With today's sophisticated software systems, it is not possible to define the entire problem, design the entire solution, build the software, and then test the end product in sequence. Instead, an iterative process that refines the problem understanding, an effective solution, and an effective plan over several iterations encourages a balanced treatment of all stakeholder objectives. Major risks must be addressed early to increase predictability and avoid expensivedownstream scrap and rework.

3. **Transition design methods to emphasize *component-based development.*** Moving from a   line-of- code mentality to a component-based mentality is necessary to reduce the amount of human-generated source code and custom development.

4. **Establish a *change management environment.*** The dynamics of iterative development, including concurrent workflows by different teams working on shared artifacts, necessitates objectivelycontrolled baselines.

FIGURE 4-1. *The top five principles of a modern process*

5. **Enhance change freedom through tools that support round-trip engineering**. Round-trip engineering is the environment support necessary to automate and synchronize

   engineering information in different formats(such as requirements specifications, design models, source code, executable code, test cases).

6. **Capture design artifacts in rigorous, model-based notation.** A model based approach (such as UML) supports the evolution of semantically rich graphical and textual design notations.

7. **Instrument the process for objective quality control and progress assessment**. Life-cycle assessment of the progress and the quality of all intermediate products must be integrated into the process.

8. **Use a demonstration-based approach to assess intermediate artifacts.**

9. **Plan intermediate releases in groups of usage scenarios with evolving levels of detail.** It is essential that the software management process drive toward early and continuous demonstrations within the operational context of the system, namely its use cases.

10. **Establish a configurable process that is economically scalable.** No single process is suitable for all software developments.

Table 4-1 maps top 10 risks of the conventional process to the key attributes and principles of a modernprocess

TABLE 4-1. *Modern process approaches for solving conventional problems*

CONVENTIONAL PROCESS: TOP 10 RISKS	IMPACT	MODERN PROCESS: INHERENT RISK RESOLUTION FEATURES
1. Late breakage and excessive scrap/rework	Quality, cost, schedule	Architecture-first approach Iterative development Automated change management Risk-confronting process
2. Attrition of key personnel	Quality, cost, schedule	Successful, early iterations Trustworthy management and planning
3. Inadequate development resources	Cost, schedule	Environments as first-class artifacts of the process Industrial-strength, integrated environments Model-based engineering artifacts Round-trip engineering
4. Adversarial stakeholders	Cost, schedule	Demonstration-based review Use-case-oriented requirements/testing
5. Necessary technology insertion	Cost, schedule	Architecture-first approach Component-based development
6. Requirements creep	Cost, schedule	Iterative development Use case modeling Demonstration-based review
7. Analysis paralysis	Schedule	Demonstration-based review Use-case-oriented requirements/testing
8. Inadequate performance	Quality	Demonstration-based performance assessment Early architecture performance feedback
9. Overemphasis on artifacts	Schedule	Demonstration-based assessment Objective quality control
10. Inadequate function	Quality	Iterative development Early prototypes, incremental releases

TRANSITIONING TO AN ITERATIVE PROCESS

Modern software development processes have moved away from the conventional waterfall model, in which each stage of the development process is dependent on completion of the previous stage.

The economic benefits inherent in transitioning from the conventional waterfall model to an iterative development process are significant but difficult to quantify. As one benchmark of the expected economic impact of process improvement, consider the process exponent parameters of the COCOMO II model. (Appendix B provides more detail on the COCOMO model) This exponent can range from 1.01 (virtually no diseconomy of scale) to 1.26 (significant diseconomy of scale). The parameters that govern the value of the process exponent are application precedentedness, process flexibility, architecture risk resolution, team cohesion, and software process maturity.

The following paragraphs map the process exponent parameters of CO COMO II to my top 10 principles ofa modern process.

- **Application precedentedness**. Domain experience is a critical factor in understanding how to plan and execute a software development project. For unprecedented systems, one of the key goals is to confront risks and establish early precedents, even if they are incomplete or experimental. This is one of the primary reasons that the software industry has moved to an *iterative life-cycle process.* Early iterations in the life cycle establish precedents from which the product, the process, and the plans can be elaborated in *evolving levels* of *detail.*

- **Process flexibility**. Development of modern software is characterized by such a broad solution space and so many interrelated concerns that there is a paramount need for continuous incorporation of changes. These changes may be inherent in the problem understanding, the solution space, or the plans. Project artifacts must be supported by efficient *change management* commensurate with project needs. A *configurable process* that allows a common framework to be adapted across a range of projects is necessary to achieve a software return on investment.

- **Architecture risk resolution**. *Architecture-first* development is a crucial theme underlying a successful iterative development process. A project team develops and stabilizes architecture before developing all the components that make up the entire suite of applications components. An *architecture-first* and *component-based development approach* forces the infrastructure, common mechanisms, and control mechanisms to be elaborated early in the life cycle and drives all component make/buy decisions into the architecture process.

- **Team cohesion**. Successful teams are cohesive, and cohesive teams are successful. Successful teams and cohesive teams share common objectives and priorities. Advances in technology (such as programming languages, UML, and visual modeling) have enabled more rigorous and understandable notations for communicating software engineering information, particularly in the requirements and design artifacts that previously were ad hoc and based completely on paper exchange. These *model-based* formats have also enabled the *round-trip engineering* support needed to establish change freedom sufficient for evolving design representations.

- **Software process maturity**. The Software Engineering Institute's Capability Maturity Model (CMM) is a well-accepted benchmark for software process assessment. One of key themes is that truly mature processes are enabled through an integrated environment that provides the appropriate level of automation to instrument the process for *objective quality control.*

Important questions

1.	*Explain briefly Waterfall model. Also explain Conventional s/w management performance?*
2.	*Define Software Economics. Also explain Pragmatic s/w cost estimation?*
3.	*Explain Important trends in improving Software economics?*
4.	*Explain five staffing principal offered by Boehm. Also explain Peer Inspections?*
5..	*Explain principles of conventional software engineering?*
6.	*Explain briefly principles of modern software management*

5. Life cycle phases

Characteristic of a successful software development process is the well-defined separation between "research and development" activities and "production" activities. Most unsuccessful projects exhibit one of the following characteristics:

- An overemphasis on research and development
- An overemphasis on production.

Successful modern projects-and even successful projects developed under the conventional process-tend to have a very well-defined project milestone when there is a noticeable transition from a research attitude to a production attitude. Earlier phases focus on achieving functionality. Later phases revolve around achieving a product that can be shipped to a customer, with explicit attention to robustness, performance, and finish.

A modern software development process must be defined to support the following:

- Evolution of the plans, requirements, and architecture, together with well defined synchronization points
- Risk management and objective measures of progress and quality
- Evolution of system capabilities through demonstrations of increasing functionality

ENGINEERING AND PRODUCTION STAGES

To achieve economies of scale and higher returns on investment, we must move toward a software manufacturing process driven by technological improvements in process automation and component-based development. Two stages of the life cycle are:

1. The **engineering stage**, driven by less predictable but smaller teams doing design and synthesis activities

2. The **production stage**, driven by more predictable but larger teams doing construction, test, and deployment activities

TABLE 5-1. *The two stages of the life cycle: engineering and production*

LIFE-CYCLE ASPECT	ENGINEERING STAGE EMPHASIS	PRODUCTION STAGE EMPHASIS
Risk reduction	Schedule, technical feasibility	Cost
Products	Architecture baseline	Product release baselines
Activities	Analysis, design, planning	Implementation, testing
Assessment	Demonstration, inspection, analysis	Testing
Economics	Resolving diseconomies of scale	Exploiting economies of scale
Management	Planning	Operations

The transition between engineering and production is a crucial event for the various stakeholders. The production plan has been agreed upon, and there is a good enough understanding of the problem and the solution that all stakeholders can make a firm commitment to go ahead with production.

Engineering stage is decomposed into two distinct phases, inception and elaboration, and the production stage into construction and transition. These four phases of the life-cycle process are loosely mapped to the conceptual framework of the spiral model as shown in Figure 5-1

Engineering Stage		Production Stage	
Inception	Elaboration	Construction	Transition

Idea	Architecture	Beta Releases	Products

FIGURE 5-1. *The phases of the life-cycle process*

INCEPTION PHASE

The overriding goal of the inception phase is to achieve concurrence among stakeholders on the life-cycleobjectives for the project.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

- Establishing the project's software scope and boundary conditions, including an operational concept, acceptance criteria, and a clear understanding of what is and is not intended to be in the product
- Discriminating the critical use cases of the system and the primary scenarios of operation that willdrive the major design trade-offs
- Demonstrating at least one candidate architecture against some of the primary scenanos
- Estimating the cost and schedule for the entire project (including detailed estimates for theelaboration phase)
- Estimating potential risks (sources of unpredictability)

ESSENTIAL ACTMTIES
- Formulating the scope of the project. The information repository should be sufficient to define the problem space and derive the acceptance criteria for the end product.
- Synthesizing the architecture. An information repository is created that is sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility of at least one candidate architecture and an, initial baseline of make/buy decisions so that the cost, schedule, and resource estimates can be derived.
- Planning and preparing a business case. Alternatives for risk management, staffing, iteration plans,and cost/schedule/profitability trade-offs are evaluated.

PRIMARY EVALUATION CRITERIA
- Do all stakeholders concur on the scope definition and cost and schedule estimates?
- Are requirements understood, as evidenced by the fidelity of the critical use cases?
- Are the cost and schedule estimates, priorities, risks, and development processes credible?
- Do the depth and breadth of an architecture prototype demonstrate the preceding criteria? (The primary value of prototyping candidate architecture is to provide a vehicle for understanding the scope and assessing the credibility of the development group in solving the particular technical problem.)
- Are actual resource expenditures versus planned expenditures acceptable

ELABORATION PHASE

At the end of this phase, the "engineering" is considered complete. The elaboration phase activities must ensure that the architecture, requirements, and plans are stable enough, and the risks sufficiently mitigated, that the cost and schedule for the completion of the development can be predicted within an acceptable range. During the elaboration phase, an executable architecture prototype is built in one or more iterations, depending on the scope, size, & risk.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVES
- Baselining the architecture as rapidly as practical (establishing a configuration-managed snapshot in whichall changes are rationalized, tracked, and maintained)
- Baselining the vision
- Baselining a high-fidelity plan for the construction phase
- Demonstrating that the baseline architecture will support the vision at a reasonable cost in a reasonabletime

ESSENTIAL ACTIVITIES
- Elaborating the vision.
- Elaborating the process and infrastructure.
- Elaborating the architecture and selecting components.

PRIMARY EVALUATION CRITERIA
- Is the vision stable?
- Is the architecture stable?
- Does the executable demonstration show that the major risk elements have been addressed and crediblyresolved?
- Is the construction phase plan of sufficient fidelity, and is it backed up with a credible basis of estimate?
- Do all stakeholders agree that the current vision can be met if the current plan is executed to develop the

complete system in the context of the current architecture?

- Are actual resource expenditures versus planned expenditures acceptable?

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

During the construction phase, all remaining components and application features are integrated into the application, and all features are thoroughly tested. Newly developed software is integrated where required. The construction phase represents a production process, in which emphasis is placed on managing resources and controlling operations to optimize costs, schedules, and quality.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

- Minimizing development costs by optimizing resources and avoiding unnecessary scrap and rework
- Achieving adequate quality as rapidly as practical
- Achieving useful versions (alpha, beta, and other test releases) as rapidly as practical

ESSENTIAL ACTIVITIES

- Resource management, control, and process optimization
- Complete component development and testing against evaluation criteria
- Assessment of product releases against acceptance criteria of the vision

PRIMARY EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Is this product baseline mature enough to be deployed in the user community? (Existing defects are not obstacles to achieving the purpose of the next release.)
- Is this product baseline stable enough to be deployed in the user community? (Pending changes are not obstacles to achieving the purpose of the next release.)
- Are the stakeholders ready for transition to the user community?
- Are actual resource expenditures versus planned expenditures acceptable?

TRANSITION PHASE

The transition phase is entered when a baseline is mature enough to be deployed in the end-user domain. This typically requires that a usable subset of the system has been achieved with acceptable quality levels and user documentation so that transition to the user will provide positive results. This phase could include any of the following activities:

1. Beta testing to validate the new system against user expectations

2. Beta testing and parallel operation relative to a legacy system it is replacing

3. Conversion of operational databases

4. Training of users and maintainers

The transition phase concludes when the deployment baseline has achieved the complete vision.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVES

- ☐ Achieving user self-supportability

- ☐ Achieving stakeholder concurrence that deployment baselines are complete and consistent with the evaluation criteria of the vision

- ☐ Achieving final product baselines as rapidly and cost-effectively as practical

ESSENTIAL ACTIVITIES

- ☐   Synchronization and integration of concurrent construction increments into consistent deploymentbaselines
- ☐   Deployment-specific engineering (cutover, commercial packaging and production, sales rollout kitdevelopment, field personnel training)
- ☐   Assessment of deployment baselines against the complete vision and acceptance criteria in therequirements set

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- ☐   Is the user satisfied?

☐ Are actual resource expenditures versus planned expenditures acceptable?

Artifacts of the process: The artifact sets, Management artifacts, Engineering artifacts, programmatic artifacts.

Model based software architectures: A Management perspective and technical perspective.

6. Artifacts of the process

THE ARTIFACT SETS

To make the development of a complete software system manageable, distinct collections of information are organized into artifact sets. A*rtifact* represents cohesive information that typically is developed and reviewed as a single entity.

Life-cycle software artifacts are organized into five distinct sets that are roughly partitioned by the underlying language of the set: management (ad hoc textual formats), requirements (organized text and models of the problem space), design (models of the solution space), implementation (human-readable programming language and associated source files), and deployment (machine-process able languages and associated files). The artifact sets are shown in Figure 6-1.

FIGURE 6-1.   *Overview of the artifact sets*

THE MANAGEMENT SET

The management set captures the artifacts associated with process planning and execution. These artifacts use ad hoc notations, including text, graphics, or whatever representation is required to capture the "contracts" among project personnel (project management, architects, developers, testers, marketers, administrators), among stakeholders (funding authority, user, software project manager, organization manager, regulatory agency), and between project personnel and stakeholders. Specific artifacts included in this set are the work breakdown structure (activity breakdown and financial tracking mechanism), the business case (cost, schedule, profit expectations), the release specifications (scope, plan, objectives for release baselines), the software development plan (project process instance), the release descriptions (results of release baselines), the status assessments (periodic snapshots of project progress), the software change orders (descriptions of discrete baseline changes), the deployment documents (cutover plan, training course, sales rollout kit), and the environment (hardware and software tools, process automation, & documentation).

Management set artifacts are evaluated, assessed, and measured through a combination of the following:

- Relevant stakeholder review
- Analysis of changes between the current version of the artifact and previous versions
- Major milestone demonstrations of the balance among all artifacts and, in particular, the accuracy ofthe business case and vision artifacts

THE ENGINEERING SETS

The engineering sets consist of the requirements set, the design set, the implementation set, and thedeployment set.

Requirements Set

Requirements artifacts are evaluated, assessed, and measured through a combination of the following:

- Analysis of consistency with the release specifications of the management set
- Analysis of consistency between the vision and the requirements models
- Mapping against the design, implementation, and deployment sets to evaluate the consistency andcompleteness and the semantic balance between information in the different sets
- Analysis of changes between the current version of requirements artifacts and previous versions(scrap, rework, and defect elimination trends)
- Subjective review of other dimensions of quality

Design Set

UML notation is used to engineer the design models for the solution. The design set contains varying levelsof abstraction that represent the components of the solution space (their identities, attributes, static relationships, dynamic interactions). The design set is evaluated, assessed, and measured through a combinationof the following:

- Analysis of the internal consistency and quality of the design model
- Analysis of consistency with the requirements models
- Translation into implementation and deployment sets and notations (for example, traceability, source code generation, compilation, linking) to evaluate the consistency and completeness and the semantic balance between information in the sets
- Analysis of changes between the current version of the design model and previous versions (scrap, rework, and defect elimination trends)
- Subjective review of other dimensions of quality

Implementation set

The implementation set includes source code (programming language notations) that represents

the tangible implementations of components (their form, interface, and dependency relationships)

Implementation sets are human-readable formats that are evaluated, assessed, and measured through a combination of the following:

- Analysis of consistency with the design models
- Translation into deployment set notations (for example, compilation and linking) to evaluate theconsistency and completeness among artifact sets
- Assessment of component source or executable files against relevant evaluation criteria throughinspection, analysis, demonstration, or testing
- Execution of stand-alone component test cases that automatically compare expected results withactual results
- Analysis of changes between the current version of the implementation set and previous versions(scrap, rework, and defect elimination trends)
- Subjective review of other dimensions of quality

Deployment Set

The deployment set includes user deliverables and machine language notations, executable software, and the

build scripts, installation scripts, and executable target specific data necessary to use the

product in its targetenvironment.

Deployment sets are evaluated, assessed, and measured through a combination of the following:

- Testing against the usage scenarios and quality attributes defined in the requirements set to evaluate the consistency and completeness and the~ semantic balance between information in the two sets

- Testing the partitioning, replication, and allocation strategies in mapping components of the implementation set to physical resources of the deployment system (platform type, number, network topology)

- Testing against the defined usage scenarios in the user manual such as installation, user-oriented

  dynamic reconfiguration, mainstream usage, and anomaly management

- Analysis of changes between the current version of the deployment set and previous versions (defect elimination trends, performance changes)

- Subjective review of other dimensions of quality

Each artifact set is the predominant development focus of one phase of the life cycle; the other sets take on check and balance roles. As illustrated in Figure 6-2, each phase has a predominant focus: Requirements are the focus of the inception phase; design, the elaboration phase; implementation, the construction phase; and deploy- ment, the transition phase. The management artifacts also evolve, but at a fairly constant level across the life cycle.

Most of today's software development tools map closely to one of the five artifact sets.

1. Management: scheduling, workflow, defect tracking, change management,documentation, spreadsheet, resource management, and presentation tools

2. Requirements: requirements management tools

3. Design: visual modeling tools

4. Implementation: compiler/debugger tools, code analysis tools, test coverage analysis tools, and testmanagement tools

5. Deployment: test coverage and test automation tools, network management tools, commercial components(operating systems, GUIs, RDBMS, networks, middleware), and installation tools.


FIGURE 6-2. Life-cycle focus on artifact sets

Implementation Set versus Deployment Set

The separation of the implementation set (source code) from the deployment set (executable code) is important because there are very different concerns with each set. The structure of the information delivered to the user (and typically the test organization) is very different from the structure of the source code information. Engineering decisions that have an impact on the quality of the deployment set but are relatively incomprehensible in the design and implementation sets include the following:

- Dynamically reconfigurable parameters (buffer sizes, color palettes, number of servers, number of simultaneous clients, data files, run-time parameters)
- Effects of compiler/link optimizations (such as space optimization versus speed optimization)
- Performance under certain allocation strategies (centralized versus distributed, primary and shadow threads, dynamic load balancing, hot backup versus checkpoint/rollback)
- Virtual machine constraints (file descriptors, garbage collection, heap size, maximum record size, disk file rotations)
- Process-level concurrency issues (deadlock and race conditions)
- Platform-specific differences in performance or behavior

ARTIFACT EVOLUTION OVER THE LIFE CYCLE

Each state of development represents a certain amount of precision in the final system description. Early in the life cycle, precision is low and the representation is generally high. Eventually, the precision of representation is high and everything is specified in full detail. Each phase of development focuses on a particular artifact set. At the end of each phase, the overall system state will have progressed on all sets, as illustrated in Figure 6-3.

FIGURE 6-3. *Life-cycle evolution of the artifact sets*

The **inception** phase focuses mainly on critical requirements usually with a secondary focus on an initial deployment view. During the **elaboration phase**, there is much greater depth in requirements, much more breadth in the design set, and further work on implementation and deployment issues. The main focus of the **construction** phase is design and implementation. The main focus of the **transition** phase is on achieving consistency and completeness of the deployment set in the context of the other sets.

TEST ARTIFACTS

- The test artifacts must be developed concurrently with the product from inception through deployment. Thus, testing is a full-life-cycle activity, not a late life-cycle activity.
- The test artifacts are communicated, engineered, and developed within the same artifact sets as the developed product.
- The test artifacts are implemented in programmable and repeatable formats (as software programs).
- The test artifacts are documented in the same way that the product is documented.
- Developers of the test artifacts use the same tools, techniques, and training as the software engineers developing the product.

Test artifact subsets are highly project-specific, the following example clarifies the relationship between test artifacts and the other artifact sets. Consider a project to perform seismic data processing for the purpose of oil exploration. This system has three fundamental subsystems: (1) a sensor subsystem that captures raw seismic data in real time and delivers these data to (2) a technical operations subsystem that converts raw data into an organized database and manages queries to this database from (3) a display subsystem that allows workstation operators to examine seismic data in human-readable form. Such a system would result in the following test artifacts:

- Management set. The release specifications and release descriptions capture the objectives, evaluation criteria, and results of an intermediate milestone. These artifacts are the test plans and test results negotiated among internal project teams. The software change orders capture test results (defects, testability changes, requirements ambiguities, enhancements) and the closure criteria associated with making a discrete change to a baseline.
- Requirements set. The system-level use cases capture the operational concept for the system and the acceptance test case descriptions, including the expected behavior of the system and its quality attributes. The entire requirement set is a test artifact because it is the basis of all assessment activities across the life cycle.
- Design set. A test model for nondeliverable components needed to test the product baselines is captured in the design set. These components include such design set artifacts as a seismic event simulation for creating realistic sensor data; a "virtual operator" that can support unattended, after- hours test cases; specific instrumentation suites for early demonstration of resource usage; transaction rates or response times; and use case test drivers and component stand-alone test drivers.
- Implementation set. Self-documenting source code representations for test components and test drivers provide the equivalent of test procedures and test scripts. These source files may also include human-readable data files representing certain statically defined data sets that are explicit test source files. Output files from test drivers provide the equivalent of test reports.
- Deployment set. Executable versions of test components, test drivers, and data files are provided.

MANAGEMENT ARTIFACTS

The management set includes several artifacts that capture intermediate results and ancillary information necessary to document the product/process legacy, maintain the product, improve the product, and improve the process.

Business Case

The business case artifact provides all the information necessary to determine whether the project is worth investing in. It details the expected revenue, expected cost, technical and management plans, and backup data necessary to demonstrate the risks and realism of the plans. The main purpose is to transform the vision into economic terms so that an organization can make an accurate ROI assessment. The financial forecasts are evolutionary, updated with more accurate forecasts as the life cycle progresses. Figure 6-4

provides a default outline for a business case.

Software Development Plan

The software development plan (SDP) elaborates the process framework into a fully detailed plan. Two indications of a useful SDP are periodic updating (it is not stagnant shelfware) and understanding and acceptance by managers and practitioners alike. Figure 6-5 provides a default outline for a software development plan.

I. Context (domain, market, scope)
II. Technical approach
    A. Feature set achievement plan
    B. Quality achievement plan
    C. Engineering trade-offs and technical risks
III. Management approach
    A. Schedule and schedule risk assessment
    B. Objective measures of success
IV. Evolutionary appendixes
    A. Financial forecast
       1. Cost estimate
       2. Revenue estimate
       3. Bases of estimates

FIGURE 6-4. *Typical business case outline*

I. Context (scope, objectives)
II. Software development process
    A. Project primitives
       1. Life-cycle phases
       2. Artifacts
       3. Workflows
       4. Checkpoints
    B. Major milestone scope and content
    C. Process improvement procedures
III. Software engineering environment
    A. Process automation (hardware and software resource configuration)
    B. Resource allocation procedures (sharing across organizations, security access)
IV. Software change management
    A. Configuration control board plan and procedures
    B. Software change order definitions and procedures
    C. Configuration baseline definitions and procedures
V. Software assessment
    A. Metrics collection and reporting procedures
    B. Risk management procedures (risk identification, tracking, and resolution)
    C. Status assessment plan
    D. Acceptance test plan
VI. Standards and procedures
    A. Standards and procedures for technical artifacts
VII. Evolutionary appendixes
   A. Minor milestone scope and content
   B. Human resources (organization, staffing plan, training plan)

FIGURE 6-5. *Typical software development plan outline*

Work Breakdown Structure

Work breakdown structure (WBS) is the vehicle for budgeting and collecting costs. To monitor and control a project's financial performance, the software project man1ger must have insight into project costs and how they are expended. The structure of cost accountability is a serious project planning constraint.

Software Change Order Database

Managing change is one of the fundamental primitives of an iterative development process. With greater change freedom, a project can iterate more productively. This flexibility increases the content, quality, and number of iterations that a project can achieve within a given schedule. Change freedom has been achieved in practice through automation, and today's iterative development environments carry the burden of change management. Organizational processes that depend on manual change management techniques haveencountered major inefficiencies.

Release Specifications

The scope, plan, and objective evaluation criteria for each baseline release are derived from the vision statement as well as many other sources (make/buy analyses, risk management concerns, architectural considerations, shots in the dark, implementation constraints, quality thresholds). These artifacts are intended to evolve along with the process, achieving greater fidelity as the life cycle progresses and requirements understanding matures. Figure 6-6 provides a default outline for a release specification


```
I.    Iteration content
II.   Measurable objectives
      A.  Evaluation criteria
      B.  Followthrough approach
III.  Demonstration plan
      A.  Schedule of activities
      B.  Team responsibilities
IV.   Operational scenarios (use cases demonstrated)
      A.  Demonstration procedures
      B.  Traceability to vision and business case
```

FIGURE 6-6. *Typical release specification outline*

Release Descriptions

Release description documents describe the results of each release, including performance against each of the evaluation criteria in the corresponding release specification. Release baselines should be accompanied by a release description document that describes the evaluation criteria for that configuration baseline and provides substantiation (through demonstration, testing, inspection, or analysis) that each criterion has been addressed in an acceptable manner. Figure 6-7 provides a default outline for a release description.

Status Assessments

Status assessments provide periodic snapshots of project health and status, including the software project manager's risk assessment, quality indicators, and management indicators. Typical status assessments should include a review of resources, personnel staffing, financial data (cost and revenue), top 10 risks, technical progress (metrics snapshots), major milestone plans and results, total project or product scope & action items

I. **Context**
   A. Release baseline content
   B. Release metrics
II. **Release notes**
   A. Release-specific constraints or limitations
III. **Assessment results**
   A. Substantiation of passed evaluation criteria
   B. Follow-up plans for failed evaluation criteria
   C. Recommendations for next release
IV. **Outstanding issues**
   A. Action items
   B. Post-mortem summary of lessons learned

FIGURE 6-7. *Typical release description outline*

Environment

An important emphasis of a modern approach is to define the development and maintenance environment as a first-class artifact of the process. A robust, integrated development environment must support automation of the development process. This environment should include requirements management, visual modeling, document automation, host and target programming tools, automated regression testing, and continuous and integrated change management, and feature and defect tracking.

Deployment

A deployment document can take many forms. Depending on the project, it could include several document subsets for transitioning the product into operational status. In big contractual efforts in which the system is delivered to a separate maintenance organization, deployment artifacts may include computer system operations manuals, software installation manuals, plans and procedures for cutover (from a legacy system), site surveys, and so forth. For commercial software products, deployment artifacts may include marketing plans, sales rollout kits, and training courses.

Management Artifact Sequences

In each phase of the life cycle, new artifacts are produced and previously developed artifacts are updated to incorporate lessons learned and to capture further depth and breadth of the solution. Figure 6-8 identifies a typical sequence of artifacts across the life-cycle phases.

△ Informal version
▲ Controlled baseline

	Inception	Elaboration		Construction			Transition
	Iteration 1	Iteration 2	Iteration 3	Iteration 4	Iteration 5	Iteration 6	Iteration 7
Management Set							
1. Work breakdown structure		▲		▲		▲	
2. Business case		▲		▲		▲	
3. Release specifications	△	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	
4. Software development plan		▲		▲		▲	
5. Release descriptions	△		△	▲	▲	▲	▲
6. Status assessments	△	△	△	△	△	△	△
7. Software change order data				▲	▲	▲	▲
8. Deployment documents					△		▲
9. Environment		△			▲		
Requirements Set							
1. Vision document		▲		▲			
2. Requirements model(s)		▲		▲			
Design Set							
1. Design model(s)		△	▲		▲		
2. Test model		△	▲		▲		
3. Architecture description		△	▲			▲	
Implementation Set							
1. Source code baselines			▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
2. Associated compile-time files			▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3. Component executables			▲	▲			
Deployment Set							
1. Integrated product-executable baselines				▲	▲	▲	▲
2. Associated run-time files				▲	▲	▲	▲
3. User manual				△		▲	

FIGURE 6-8. *Artifact sequences across a typical life cycle*

ENGINEERING ARTIFACTS

Most of the engineering artifacts are captured in rigorous engineering notations such as UML, programming languages, or executable machine codes. Three engineering artifacts are explicitly intended for more general review, and they deserve further elaboration.

Vision Document

The vision document provides a complete vision for the software system under development and. supports the contract between the funding authority and the development organization. A project vision is meant to be changeable as understanding evolves of the requirements, architecture, plans, and technology. A good vision document should change slowly. Figure 6-9 provides a default outline for a vision document.

```
I.    Feature set description
      A.   Precedence and priority
II.   Quality attributes and ranges
III.  Required constraints
      A.   External interfaces
IV.   Evolutionary appendixes
      A.   Use cases
           1.   Primary scenarios
           2.   Acceptance criteria and tolerances
      B.   Desired freedoms (potential change scenarios)
```

FIGURE 6-9.   *Typical vision document outline*

Architecture Description

The architecture description provides an organized view of the software architecture under development. It is extracted largely from the design model and includes views of the design, implementation, and deployment sets sufficient to understand how the operational concept of the requirements set will be achieved. The breadth of the architecture description will vary from project to project depending on many factors. Figure 6-10 provides a default outline for an architecture description.

```
I.    Architecture overview
      A.   Objectives
      B.   Constraints
      C.   Freedoms
II.   Architecture views
      A.   Design view
      B.   Process view
      C.   Component view
      D.   Deployment view
III.  Architectural interactions
      A.   Operational concept under primary scenarios
      B.   Operational concept under secondary scenarios
      C.   Operational concept under anomalous conditions
IV.   Architecture performance
V.    Rationale, trade-offs, and other substantiation
```

FIGURE 6-10.   *Typical architecture description outline*

Software User Manual

The software user manual provides the user with the reference documentation necessary to support the delivered software. Although content is highly variable across application domains, the user manual should include installation procedures, usage procedures and guidance, operational constraints, and a user interface description, at a minimum. For software products with a user interface, this manual should be developed early in the life cycle because it is a necessary mechanism for communicating and stabilizing an important subset of requirements. The user manual should be written by members of the test team, who are more likely to understand the user's perspective than the development team.

PRAGMATIC ARTIFACTS

- **People want to review information but don't understand the language of the artifact**. Many interested reviewers of a particular artifact will resist having to learn the engineering language in which the artifact is written. It is not uncommon to find people (such as veteran software managers, veteran quality assurance specialists, or an auditing authority from a regulatory agency) who react as follows: "I'm not going to learn UML, but I want to review the design of this software, so give me a separate description such as some flowcharts and text that I can understand."

- **People want to review the information but don't have access to the tools.** It is not very common for the development organization to be fully tooled; it is extremely rare that the/other stakeholders have any capability to review the engineering artifacts on-line. Consequently, organizations are forced to exchange paper documents. Standardized formats (such as UML, spreadsheets, Visual Basic, C++, and Ada 95), visualization tools, and the Web are rapidly making it economically feasible for all stakeholders to exchange information electronically.

- **Human-readable engineering artifacts should use rigorous notations that are complete, consistent, and used in a self-documenting manner.** Properly spelled English words should be used for all identifiers and descriptions. Acronyms and abbreviations should be used only where they are well accepted jargon in the context of the component's usage. Readability should be emphasized and the use of proper English words should be required in all engineering artifacts. This practice enables understandable representations, browse able formats (paperless review), more-rigorous notations, and reduced error rates.

- **Useful documentation is self-defining: It is documentation that gets used.**

- **Paper is tangible; electronic artifacts are too easy to change**. On-line and Web-based artifacts can be changed easily and are viewed with more skepticism because of their inherent volatility.

Important questions

1.	Explain briefly two stages of the life cycle engineering and production.
2.	Explain different phases of the life cycle process?
3.	Explain the goal of Inception phase, Elaboration phase, Construction phase andTransition phase.
4.	Explain the overview of the artifact set
5.	Write a short note on (a) Management Artifacts (b) Engineering Artifacts (c) Pragmatic Artifacts

7. Model based software architecture

ARCHITECTURE: A MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

The most critical technical product of a software project is its architecture: the infrastructure, control, and data interfaces that permit software components to cooperate as a system and software designers to cooperate efficiently as a team. When the communications media include multiple languages and intergroup literacy varies, the communications problem can become extremely complex and even unsolvable. If a software development team is to be successful, the inter project communications, as captured in the software architecture, must be both accurate and precise

From a management perspective, there are three different aspects of architecture.

1. An *architecture* (the intangible design concept) is the design of a software system this includes all engineering necessary to specify a complete bill of materials.

2. An *architecture baseline* (the tangible artifacts) is a slice of information across the engineering artifact sets sufficient to satisfy all stakeholders that the vision (function and quality) can be achieved within the parameters of the business case (cost, profit, time, technology, and people).

3. An *architecture description* (a human-readable representation of an architecture, which is one of the components of an architecture baseline) is an organized subset of information extracted from the design set model(s). The architecture description communicates how the intangible concept is realized in the tangible artifacts.

The number of views and the level of detail in each view can vary widely.

The importance of software architecture and its close linkage with modern software development processes canbe summarized as follows:

- Achieving a stable software architecture represents a significant project milestone at which thecritical make/buy decisions should have been resolved.

- Architecture representations provide a basis for balancing the trade-offs between the problem space(requirements and constraints) and the solution space (the operational product).

- The architecture and process encapsulate many of the important (high-payoff or high-risk)communications among individuals, teams, organizations, and stakeholders.

- Poor architectures and immature processes are often given as reasons for project failures.

- A mature process, an understanding of the primary requirements, and a demonstrable architecture areimportant prerequisites for predictable planning.

- Architecture development and process definition are the intellectual steps that map the problem to asolution without violating the constraints; they require human innovation and cannot be automated.

ARCHITECTURE: A TECHNICAL PERSPECTIVE

An architecture framework is defined in terms of views that are abstractions of the UML models in the design set. The design model includes the full breadth and depth of information. An architecture view is an abstraction of the design model; it contains only the architecturally significant information. Most real-world systems require four views: design, process, component, and deployment. The purposes of these views are as follows:

- Design: describes architecturally significant structures and functions of the design model

- Process: describes concurrency and control thread relationships among the design, component, anddeployment views

- Component: describes the structure of the implementation set

- Deployment: describes the structure of the deployment set

Figure 7-1 summarizes the artifacts of the design set, including the architecture views and architecturedescription.

The requirements model addresses the behavior of the system as seen by its end users, analysts, and testers. This view is modeled statically using use case and class diagrams, and dynamically using sequence, collaboration, state chart, and activity diagrams.

- The *use case view* describes how the system's critical (architecturally significant) use cases are

  realized by elements of the design model. It is modeled statically using use case diagrams, and dynamically using any of the UML behavioral diagrams.

- The *design view* describes the architecturally significant elements of the design model. This view, an

  abstraction of the design model, addresses the basic structure and functionality of the solution. It is modeled statically using class and object diagrams, and dynamically using any of the UML behavioral diagrams.

- The *process view* addresses the run-time collaboration issues involved in executing the architecture on a distributed deployment model, including the logical software network topology (allocation to processes and threads of control), interprocess communication, and state management. This view is modeled statically using deployment diagrams, and dynamically using any of the UML behavioral diagrams.

- The *component view* describes the architecturally significant elements of the implementation set. This view, an abstraction of the design model, addresses the software source code realization of the system from the perspective of the project's integrators and developers, especially with regard to releases and configuration management. It is modeled statically using component diagrams, and dynamically using any of the UML behavioral diagrams.

- The *deployment view* addresses the executable realization of the system, including the allocation of logical processes in the distribution view (the logical software topology) to physical resources of the deployment network (the physical system topology). It is modeled statically using deployment dia- grams, and dynamically using any of the UML behavioral diagrams.

Generally, an architecture baseline should include the following:

- Requirements: critical use cases, system-level quality objectives, and priority relationships among features and qualities

- Design: names, attributes, structures, behaviors, groupings, and relationships of significant classes and components

- Implementation: source component inventory and bill of materials (number, name, purpose, cost) of all primitive components

- Deployment: executable components sufficient to demonstrate the critical use cases and the risk associated with achieving the system qualities

Requirements	Design	Implementation	Deployment

The requirements set may include UML models describing the problem space.

The design set includes all UML design models describing the solution space.

Depending on its complexity, a system may require several models or partitions of a single model.

Use Case Model

Design Model | Process Model | Component Model | Deployment Model

The *design*, *process*, and *use case models* provide for visualization of the logical and behavioral aspects of the design.

The *component model* provides for visualization of the implementation set.

The *deployment model* provides for visualization of the deployment set.

An architecture is described through several views, which are extracts of design models that capture the significant structures, collaborations, and behaviors.

Use Case View

Design View | Process View | Component View | Deployment View

Architecture Description Document

Design view
Process view
Use case view
Component view
Deployment view
Other views (optional)
Other material:
 • Rationale
 • Constraints

FIGURE 7-1. *Architecture, an organized and abstracted view into the design models*