No Silver Bullet

CSCI 5828: Foundations of Software Engineering
Lecture 02 — 08/27/2015
Getting my Act Together

• Two Announcements
  
  • First: in Lecture 1, I had a slide that “announced” my office hours as Fridays from 2 PM to 3 PM
  
  • Second: I also confidently proclaimed that the midterm was going to be held on Tuesday of Week 8: October 13th
  
  • BOTH OF THESE ANNOUNCEMENTS WERE WRONG (sigh)
  
  • So, let’s try this again
Office Hours

- Mondays, 3 PM from 4 PM
- Wednesdays, 12 PM to 1 PM
  - DLC 170 (shown in red on right)
- Please send me e-mail to let me know you plan to stop by
  - There WILL be some days where I cannot hold the office hours as planned
  - So, if you e-mail me beforehand I can let you know if it will work for sure
Midterm

• The midterm will be held on Tuesday, October 20th
  
  • BBA students will need to work with BBA to identify a person to proctor their midterm exam; You will have from October 20th to October 27th (one week) to take your exam and have it sent to me by your proctor
  
  • This is Week 9 of the semester
    
    • It turns out that I am gone for a trip to the Grace Hopper conference during week 8.

    • That means that I will be pre-taping week 8’s lectures during week 7. They will run at the regular class times during week 8 while I’m gone.

• Questions?
Lecture Goals

• Introduce thesis of Fred Brook’s No Silver Bullet

• Classic essay by Fred Brooks discussing “Why is SE so hard?”
No Silver Bullet

• “There is no single development, in either technology or management technique, which by itself promises even one order-of-magnitude improvement within a decade in productivity, in reliability, in simplicity.”
  
  • — Fred Brooks, 1986

• i.e. There is no magical cure for the “software crisis”

• NOTE: From this statement you can infer the definition of a “silver bullet”:
  
  • A single technique or technology that by itself can deliver one order-of-magnitude improvement to some aspect of software development.

• Note: one order of magnitude is the same as saying a 10x improvement
Why? Essence and Accidents

• Brooks divides the problems facing software engineering into two categories
  • **essence**: difficulties inherent, or intrinsic, in the nature of software
  • **accidents**: difficulties related to the production of software

• Brooks argues that **most techniques attack the accidents** of software engineering
An Order of Magnitude

• In order to improve software development by a factor of 10
  
  • first, the accidents of software engineering would have to account for 90% of the overall effort
  
  • second, tools would have to reduce accidental problems to zero
  
  • Brooks doesn't believe that the former is true…
    
    • and the latter is nigh impossible because each new tool or technique solves some problems while introducing others
The Essence

• Brooks divides the essence into four subcategories
  • complexity
  • conformity
  • changeability
  • invisibility

• Let's consider each in turn
Complexity (I)

• Software entities are amazingly complex
  • No two parts (above statements) are alike
  • Contrast with materials in other domains

• Large software systems have a huge number of states
  • Brooks claims they have an order of magnitude more states than computers (i.e. hardware) do

• As the size of a system increases, both the number and types of parts increase exponentially
  • the latter increase is the most significant
Complexity (II)

- You can't abstract away the complexity of the application domain. Consider:
  - air traffic control, international banking, avionics software

- These domains are intrinsically complex and this complexity will appear in the software system as designers attempt to model the domain
  - Complexity also comes from the numerous and tight relationships between heterogeneous software artifacts such as specs, docs, code, test cases, etc.
Complexity (III)

• Problems resulting from complexity
  • difficult team communication
  • product flaws; cost overruns; schedule delays
  • personnel turnover (loss of knowledge)
  • unenumerated states (lots of them)
  • lack of extensibility (complexity of structure)
  • unanticipated states (security loopholes)
  • project overview is difficult
Conformity (I)

• A lot of complexity facing software engineers is **arbitrary**

  • Consider designing a software system to support an existing business process when a new VP arrives at the company

    • The VP decides to “make a mark” on the company and changes the business process

    • Our system must now conform to the (from our perspective) **arbitrary changes** imposed by the VP
Conformity (II)

• Other instances of conformity
  • Adapting to a pre-existing environment
    • such as integrating with legacy systems
    • and if the environment changes (for whatever reason), you can bet that software will be asked to change in response
  • Implementing regulations or rules that may change from year to year
  • Dealing with a change in vendor imposed by your customer

• Main Point: It is almost impossible to plan for arbitrary change;
  • instead, you just have to wait for it to occur and deal with it when it happens
Changeability (I)

• Software is constantly asked to change
  • Other things are too, however, manufactured things are rarely changed after they have been created
    • instead, changes appear in later models
      • automobiles are recalled only infrequently
      • buildings are expensive to remodel
Changeability (II)

- With software, **the pressure to change is greater**
  - in a project, it is functionality that is often asked to change and **software equals functionality** (plus its malleable)
  - clients of a software project often don't understand enough about software to understand when a change request requires significant rework of an existing system
    - Contrast with more tangible domains
      - Imagine asking for a new layout of a house after the foundation has been poured
Invisibility (I)

• Software is, by its nature, invisible and intangible; it is difficult to design graphical displays of software that convey meaning to developers
  
  • Contrast to blueprints: here geometry can be used to identify problems and help optimize the use of space

• But with software, its difficult to reduce it to diagrams
  
  • UML contains 13 different diagram types (!)
    
    • to model class structure, object relationships, activities, event handling, software architecture, deployment, packages, etc.
  
  • The notations of the different types almost never appear in the same diagram
    
    • they really do document 13 different aspects of the software system!
Invisibility (II)

• Hard to get both a “big picture” view as well as details
  • Hard to convey just one issue on a single diagram
  • instead multiple concerns crowd and/or clutter the diagram hindering understanding

• This lack of visualization deprives the engineer from using the brain's powerful visual skills
What about “X”?

• Brooks argues that past breakthroughs solve accidental difficulties
  • High-level languages
  • Time-Sharing
  • Programming Environments
  • OO Analysis, Design, Programming
  • ...

Promising Attacks on the Essence

• Buy vs. Build
  • Don't develop software when you can avoid it

• Rapid Prototyping
  • Use to clarify requirements

• Incremental Development
  • don't build software, grow it

• Great designers
  • Be on the look out for them, when you find them, don't let go!
No Silver Bullet, Take 2

• Brooks reflects on No Silver Bullet‡, ten years later
  • Lots of people have argued that their methodology, technique, or tool is the silver bullet for software engineering
    • If so, they didn't meet the **deadline of 10 years** or the target of a **10 times improvement** in the production of software
  • Others misunderstood what Brooks calls “obscure writing”
    • e.g., “accidental” did not mean “occurring by chance”;
      • instead, he meant that the use of technique A for benefit B unfortunately introduced problem C into the process of software development

‡ This reflection appears in The Mythical Man-Month, 20th Anniversary Edition
The Size of Accidental Effort

• Some people misunderstood his point with the 90% figure
  • Brooks doesn't actually think that accidental effort is 90% of the job
    • its much smaller than that
• As a result, reducing it to zero (which is impossible) will not give you an order of magnitude improvement
Obtaining the Increase

• Some people interpreted Brooks as saying that the essence could never be attacked
  
  • That's not his point; he said that no single technique could produce an order of magnitude increase by itself
  
  • He argues instead that several techniques in tandem could achieve it but that requires industry-wide enforcement and discipline
  
• Brooks states:
  
  • “We will surely make substantial progress over the next 40 years; an order of magnitude improvement over 40 years is hardly magical…”
Quiz Yourself

• Essence or Accident?

• A bug in a financial system is discovered that came from a conflict in state/federal regulations on one type of transaction

• A program developed in two weeks using a whiz bang new application framework is unable to handle multiple threads since the framework is not thread safe

• A new version of a compiler generates code that crashes on 32-bit architectures; the previous version did not

• A fickle customer submits 10 change requests per week after receiving the first usable version of a software system
Coming Up Next

• Lecture 2a: Git, Github, and Markdown

• Homework 1 is due by the start of Lecture 4 (next Thursday)
  • See class website for details