“Without requirements and design, programming is the art of adding bugs to an empty text file.”
— Louis Srygley
Coding Is Essentially 0% of Creating Software

2013 Embedded Market Study

What percentage of your design time is spent on each of the following stages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>2013 (N = 1,928)</th>
<th>2012 (N = 1,535)</th>
<th>2011 (N = 1,679)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing overall system specs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual design stage</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed design stage</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation stage</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and debugging</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototyping</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending to production</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation/coding/mtgs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://e.ubmelectronics.com/2013EmbeddedStudy/index.html
Old-School Waterfall Development Cycle

- Effective for well understood domains
  - Works best if you don’t make many big mistakes
    - Variations on existing systems
    - Expensive to fix things that escape to test steps
  - Any problem encountered requires backtracking
    - Note: original waterfall paper had these backward arrows! It was never just a unidirectional process
How To Get High Quality Software

- **Product Testing**
  - Late & Expensive
  - Many field escapes

- **Software Testing**
  - Unit & Integration test

- **Code Peer Review**
  - Earlier & Cheaper

- **Design Peer Review**
  - Earlier & Cheaper
What We’ve Learned in 50+ Years of Software

- Dividing up into subsystems is critical
  - Bad architecture will doom a project

- Process formality is a good investment
  - Traceability, formal reviews, etc.
  - Skipping steps costs more in the end

- Requirements change
  - Suggests using an iterated approach

- Finding bugs early is important
  - Traceability from high to low levels
  - Layered testing
  - Peer reviews, especially on left side of V

- If the second half of the project is “debugging” that must mean the first half is “bugging”

  — Jack Ganssle

http://www.ganssle.com/rants/on_testing.htm (paraphrase)
Emphasizes traceability

- Supports subsystem decomposition
- Peer Reviews on left side of V
Implementation: the code itself
- Comments describe the implementation; they aren’t the design

Detailed Design (DD)
- Flowcharts
- Statecharts
- Algorithms, control diagrams, etc.

High Level Design (HLD): architecture, component defs.
- Pieces of the system (e.g., classes, subsystems)
- Functional allocation to the pieces
- Interfaces between the systems
Software Requirements Specification (SRS)
- Says “what” the system does, not “how” it does it
  - If it’s not in the SRS, the software shouldn’t do it
  - Avoids details unless mandatory due to marketing reqts.
- Often paired with a Hardware Requirements Spec.

Product Requirements Specification (PRS)
- Market-facing product requirements
  - What the system does from a user point of view
- Point of interface between software group and others
  - Might just be a feature list
  - Might be in form of customer-specified acceptance test
If you think good design is expensive, you should look at the cost of bad design!

https://youtu.be/j-zczJXSxnw
Unit Test: Traces to DD
- Test individual subroutines, procedures, “modules”

Integration Test: Traces to HLD
- Test module interactions (e.g., sequence diagrams)

Software Test: Traces to SRS
- Test functionality knowing how software is built

Acceptance Test: Traces to PRS
- Test customer-facing functionality

Other activities:
- Software Quality Assurance (SQA): did you follow the steps?
- Peer Reviews: check quality of every step
- Regression Test: test after bug fix to make sure bugs stay dead

“I think you should be more explicit here in step two.”
From *What’s so Funny about Science?* by Sidney Harris (1977)
How Much “Paper” Is Enough?

- Old military development saying:  
  - Deploy when the paper is heavier than the system. (Even aircraft carriers!)

- Does all this mean you need to be buried in paper? No.
  - Paper required to check process health  
    - Be clever about minimizing paper bulk  
    - But if code has no paperwork, throw the code out
  - Put things on paper as you go through the Vee  
    - “Documentation” after writing code is really inefficient  
    - If you aren’t going to maintain paper, throw it out
Principles behind the Agile Manifesto

We follow these principles:

Our highest priority is to satisfy the customer through early and continuous delivery of valuable software.

Welcome changing requirements, even late in development. Agile processes harness change for the customer’s competitive advantage.

Deliver working software frequently, from a couple of weeks to a couple of months, with a preference to the shorter timescale.

Business people and developers must work together daily throughout the project.

Build projects around motivated individuals. Give them the environment and support they need, and trust them to get the job done.

The most efficient and effective method of conveying information to and within a development team is face-to-face conversation.

Working software is the primary measure of progress.

Agile processes promote sustainable development. The sponsors, developers, and users should be able to maintain a constant pace indefinitely.

Continuous attention to technical excellence and good design enhances agility.

Simplicity—the art of maximizing the amount of work not done—is essential.

The best architectures, requirements, and designs emerge from self-organizing teams.

At regular intervals, the team reflects on how to become more effective, then tunes and adjusts its behavior accordingly.

Agile Methods

- **Agile generally values:**
  - **Individuals and Interactions** over processes and tools
  - **Working Software** over comprehensive documentation
  - **Customer Collaboration** over contract negotiation
  - **Responding to Change** over following a plan

- **Example: Scrum**
  - Daily “stand up” (“scrum”) meetings for face-to-face collaboration
  - 2-4 week long sprints to incrementally add functionality
    - Each sprint implements items from a backlog
    - Demo at end of sprint; theoretically a shippable product
  - User stories serve as requirements
  - Scrum challenges
    - Geographically split teams with informal communication
    - External dependencies (e.g., other parts of system change)
    - No time for extensive testing, especially embedded hardware

http://agilemanifesto.org/principles.html
Scrum Process Example

- Heavy on implicit knowledge
  - Can you find: requirements, design, test plan, acceptance test

https://goo.gl/CkrCzR
How Are Agile Methods Different?

- Development model + quality approach + techniques
  - Multiple ideas: self-organizing teams, incremental development
    - Emphasizes adaptation to change & incremental definition of requirements
  - At its best for iterated prototyping or always-evolving IT software
    - All developers “above average” and low personnel turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOFTWARE QUALITY APPROACH</td>
<td>ACCEPTANCE TESTS</td>
<td>PRESCRIBED ACTIVITIES (CMM(I) 1989; PSP/TSP 1996+)</td>
<td>STATISTICAL QUALITY CONTROL (CLEANROOM 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESCRIBED TECHNIQUES (IEC 61508 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knight & Koopman
Significant benefit is that it makes (good) developers happier
- If done well can help with evolving requirements
- But, but you need to manage and moderate the risks

Issue: “Agile” is not just cowboy coding
- Undefined, undisciplined processes are bad news
- Yes, Agile teams should follow a rigorously defined process

Issue: “No-paper” Agile unsuitable for long-lived systems
- Implicit knowledge is efficient, but evaporates with the team
- 10+ year old undocumented legacy systems are a nightmare

Issue: Agile assumes 100% automated acceptance test
- 100% automated system test is often impractical for physical interfaces
- Often implicitly assumes that defect escapes are low cost because a new version is 2-4 weeks away

Issue: Agile typically doesn’t have independent process monitoring (SQA)
- Software Quality Assurance (SQA) tells you if your process is working
- Agile teams may be dysfunctional and have no idea this is happening
  - Or they may be fine – but who knows if they are really healthy or not?
When Is Agile a Good Fit?

Source: Boehm & Turner 2004, Balancing Agility and Discipline

**Agile:**
- Small teams; small products
- “Everyday” software quality
- Fast requirements change
- High-skill experts throughout project
  - Including life-cycle maintenance
- Developers can handle being empowered; usually senior

**Plan-Driven (traditional):**
- Large teams; large products
- Mission-critical products
- Stable requirements
- High skill primarily in design phase
  - Major versions require expert design
- Most developers are not empowered; usually junior
Review: How Do the Pieces Fit Together?

- **SPECIFY PRODUCT**
  - Product Requirements

- **SPECIFY SOFTWARE**
  - Software Requirements

- **CREATE SW ARCHITECTURE**
  - High Level Design

- **DESIGN MODULES**
  - Detailed Design

- **IMPLEMENT**
  - Source Code

- **UNIT TEST**
  - Test Results

- **INTEGRATION TEST**
  - Unit Test Results
  - Integration Test Results

- **SOFTWARE TEST**
  - Test Plan & Test Results

- **ACCEPTANCE TEST**
  - Software Test Results

- **PRODUCT**
  - Test Plan & Test Results

---

What does each “artifact” look like?
Best Practices For Software Process

Follow a defined process
- Must include all aspects shown on Vee
  - And SQA, Peer Reviews
- It’s OK to rename and reorganize steps
  - All the steps have to get done
  - Common to see “AgileFall” etc.
  - Also common to see bad process dressed up with the latest buzzwords

Software Process Pitfalls
- Skipping steps to get to testing faster means more bugs in test
  - Finding bugs is more expensive in testing
- Using the wrong process for the wrong purpose
  - 3-Week product life and 30 year product life are different situations