



Achieving Agility and Stability in Large-Scale Software Development



Ipek Ozkaya
Senior Researcher,
Research, Technology, and System Solutions Program

Ipek Ozkaya is a senior member of the technical staff in the Research, Technology, and System Solutions Program at the SEI. She is currently engaged in activities focusing on large scale agile and architecture and works to develop, apply, and communicate effective methods to improve software development efficiency. Ozkaya serves as the chair of the advisory board of the *IEEE Software* magazine and is also a member of the technical faculty for the Master of Software Engineering Program at Carnegie Mellon University.



Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 16 JAN 2013		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2013 to 00-00-2013	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Achieving Agility and Stability in Large-Scale Software Development				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Carnegie Mellon University ,Software Engineering Institute,Pittsburgh,PA,15213				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 34	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Agenda

Concepts of scale and root-cause analysis

Tactics that can help

Examples



Are we asking the right question?

How much should we architect?

- This process, or that one...


When should we architect?

- Balancing anticipation versus adaptation...





Increased visibility into delivery


Focus on Priority



Focus on Cost



Focus on Integrated Value



Polling question

Which software development process are you currently using?

1. Agile software development (e.g., using Scrum, XP practices, test-driven development)
2. Waterfall/phased-based development
3. Rational unified process
4. Organization-specific iterative and incremental development
5. None of the above




Symptoms of failure


- Teams (e.g., Scrum teams, product development teams, component teams, feature teams) spend almost all of their time fixing defects, and new capability development is continuously slipping.
- Integration of products built by different teams reveals that incompatibility defects cause many failure conditions and lead to significant out-of-cycle rework in addition to end-to-end fault-tolerance failure.
- High testing costs result in some testing activities to be eliminated.




A closer look at scale: Scope



- Is the project in a new domain or technology?
- Does the project have new requirements—such as standards compliance, system testing, and integration lab environments—or does it simply have more features, elements, and relationships?
- Is there a need to align systems engineering and software development activities?



A closer look at scale: Team



- Are there multiple teams that need to interact, both internal and external to the organization?
- What are the dependencies between the work products of system and software engineers?
- Have you considered the end-to-end success of features that may require resources from multiple teams?



A closer look at scale: Time



- Does the work require different schedule constraints for releases?
- How long is the work product expected to be in service?
- How important are sustainability and evolution?




Polling question

Are you currently doing development in a large-scale context that can be captured by extended scope, team size, or timelines of scale?

1. Large team size
2. Larger than normal scope
3. Longer development roadmap
4. Product expected to be in service for a long time
5. At least two of the above



Root-cause analysis



Investigate both technical and nontechnical areas, looking at both Agile software development and software architecture fundamentals.



Root-cause analysis

Response to change


- Dynamic environment and changing requirements are understood.
- Necessary technology and processes are identified to respond to change.
- Impact of uncertainty on the project is acknowledged.
- Waste is identified and tradeoffs managed (e.g., technical debt and defects).



Root-cause analysis

Culture

- People are made available (internal and external), including an appropriate number of people who have the right skills and knowledge and clear responsibilities.
- Team members are motivated and empowered by many degrees of freedom.
- Clear communication among teams and team members is established.
- There is high-level management support.



Root-cause analysis

Quality attributes

- The importance of quality attribute requirements is understood.
- Quality attribute requirements are defined and tied to business goals.
- Means for analysis of necessary quality attributes are in place and used to predict system properties.
- Measurement environment is in place to monitor the implemented system quality and “done” criteria.



Root-cause analysis

Architecture

- Evidence is provided that the architecture satisfies quality attribute requirements.
- Appropriate functional requirements are assigned to architecture elements.
- Architectural issues (e.g., technical debt) are tracked and managed.
- Timeline of critical architectural decisions is clear and scheduled.



Tactics to consider

Align feature and system decomposition.

Create an architectural runway.

Use matrix teams and architecture.



Align feature and system decomposition

Dependencies between stories & supporting architectural elements

Understanding the dependencies between stories and architectural elements enables staged implementation of technical infrastructure in support of achieving stakeholder value.

Dependencies among architectural elements

Low-dependency architectures are a critical enabler for scaling up Agile development.¹

Dependencies among stories

High-value stories may require the implementation of lower value stories as precursors.²


1. Poppendieck, M., and Poppendieck, T. *Leading Lean Software Development*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2009.

2. Denne, M., and Cleland-Huang, J. *Software by Numbers*. Prentice Hall, 2003.




Align feature and system decomposition

Tension between high-priority features (vertical decomposition) and common reusable services (horizontal decomposition)




Align feature and system decomposition

Two examples




Layered architecture with frameworks



Layered architecture with plug-ins

Decouple teams and architecture to ensure parallel progress as the number of teams increases.



Create an architectural runway


The architectural runway provides the degree of architectural stability to support the next n iterations of development.

In a Scrum project environment, the architectural runway may be established during Sprint 0.

- Sprint 0 might have a longer duration than the rest of the sprints.



Create an architectural runway



© 2008 Leffingwell, LLC.

The bigger the system, the longer the runway.
Leffingwell, Martens, Zamora


Leffingwell, D. *Scaling Software Agility*. Addison-Wesley, 2007.

<http://scalingsoftwareagility.wordpress.com/2008/09/09/enterprise-agility-the-big-picture-10-the-system-team>




Use matrix teams and architecture

Establishing the infrastructure




Use matrix teams and architecture

Feature development in parallel




Use matrix teams and architecture

Different teams are assigned to different features, and some team members are assigned to keep layers and framework consistent.



Use matrix teams and architecture

Different teams are assigned to different features, and a temporary team is assigned to prepare layers and frameworks for future feature teams.



Example 1: Inability to manage scope and time

Symptom

- Scrum teams spend almost all of their time fixing defects, and new feature development is continuously slipping.

Root-cause

- Initial focus was “general” rather than “product specific.”
 - Time pressure to deliver became the top priority.
 - The team delivered an immature product.
 - A plethora of variation parameters interact detrimentally.
- There are three different cycles:
 1. Customer release (annually, many variants)
 2. IV&V Testing (quarterly, 4 variants)
 3. Developmental (monthly, 1 variant)



Solution

Stabilize the architecture.

- Build an architecture for current products.
 - Rules, guidelines
 - Over a few time boxes
- Reduce the number of “variant parameterizations.”
- Make everyone play from the same sheet music.
- Postpone adding new features.

Re-plan the release cycles/time boxes.

Revisit the testing strategy/team assignments against variants.



Example 2: Inability to manage teams and scope

Symptom

- Integration of products built by different Scrum teams reveals that incompatibility defects cause many failure conditions and lead to significant out-of-cycle rework.

Root cause

Cross-team coordination is poor, even though there are many coordination points and much time spent.

- Different teams have different interpretations of interfaces.
- The product owner on each Scrum team does not see the big picture.
- A mismatch exists between the architecture and Scrum development.



Solution

Stabilize to remove failures.

- Postpone adding new features.

Identify and collapse common services across teams.

Use an architectural runway.

- A system that has an architectural runway contains existing or planned infrastructure sufficient to allow incorporation of current and near-term anticipated requirements without excessive refactoring.
- An architectural runway is represented by *infrastructure* initiatives that have the same level of importance as the larger scale requirements epics that drive the company's vision forward.



Final thoughts

Systematic root-cause analysis is essential for understanding risks arising in large-scale software development.

Embracing the principles of both Agile software development and software architecture provide improved visibility of project status and better tactics for risk management.

- Align feature and system decomposition.
- Create an architectural runway.
- Use matrix teams and architecture.

Architecting is an ongoing activity throughout the software development life cycle regardless of choice of process.



References

- Ambler, S. The Agile Scaling Model (ASM): Adapting Agile Methods for Complex Environments. IBM developerWorks, 2009.
- Bachmann, F., Nord, R. L., Ozkaya, I. Architectural Tactics to Support Rapid and Agile Stability. *Crosstalk* May/June 2012:
- Brown, N., Nord, R., and Ozkaya, I. Enabling Agility Through Architecture. *Crosstalk* Nov./Dec. 2010: 12–17.
- Denne, M., and Cleland-Huang, J. Software by Numbers, Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Kruchten, P., Nord, R. L., Ozkaya, I.: Technical Debt: From Metaphor to Theory and Practice. *IEEE Software* 29(6): 18-21 (2012)
- Kruchten, P. “What Color Is Your Backlog?” Agile Vancouver talk, 2009.
<http://files.me.com/philippe.kruchten/vuldw4>
- Larman, C., and Voddle, B. Scaling Lean & Agile Development. Addison-Wesley, 2009.
- Leffingwell, D. Scaling Software Agility. Addison-Wesley, 2007.
- Nord, R.L., Ozkaya, I., Sangwan, R. S. Making Architecture Visible to Improve Flow Management in Lean Software Development. *IEEE Software* 29(5): 33-39 (2012)
- Poppendieck, M., and Poppendieck, T. Leading Lean Software Development. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2009.



Contact Information



Ipek Ozkaya

Senior Member of the Technical Staff

Research, Technology, and System Solutions Program

Architecture Practices Initiative

Email: ozkaya@sei.cmu.edu

Software Engineering Institute

Customer Relations

4500 Fifth Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2612

USA



Software Engineering Institute | **Carnegie Mellon**

Architecting in a Complex World
Twitter [#SEIVirtualEvent](#)
© 2013 Carnegie Mellon University

Copyright 2013 Carnegie Mellon University.

This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Defense under Contract No. FA8721-05-C-0003 with Carnegie Mellon University for the operation of the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center.

Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Department of Defense.

NO WARRANTY

THIS CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN “AS-IS” BASIS. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.

This material has been approved for public release and unlimited distribution except as restricted below.

Internal use:* Permission to reproduce this material and to prepare derivative works from this material for internal use is granted, provided the copyright and “No Warranty” statements are included with all reproductions and derivative works.

External use:* This material may be reproduced in its entirety, without modification, and freely distributed in written or electronic form without requesting formal permission. Permission is required for any other external and/or commercial use. Requests for permission should be directed to the Software Engineering Institute at permission@sei.cmu.edu.

*These restrictions do not apply to U.S. government entities.



Q&A



New SEI eLearning Portal Brings SEI Courses to You

The SEI is pleased to announce the new **SEI eLearning Portal**, a new platform for the development and delivery of SEI eLearning courses to conveniently meet your professional development needs.

The SEI eLearning Portal provides expert instruction as well as exercises, assessments, and other resources, creating a rich educational experience that is accessible by learners worldwide.

- learn at your own pace
- communicate easily with instructors
- access courses 24/7
- study at home, work, or on the road
- read materials online or download for later
- track your course progress

<http://www.sei.cmu.edu/training/elearning>



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon

Architecting in a Complex World
Twitter **#SEIVirtualEvent**
© 2013 Carnegie Mellon University