3 Agile Software Development

Objectives

The objective of this chapter is to introduce you agile software development methods. When you have read the chapter, you will:

- understand the rationale for agile software development methods, the agile manifesto and the differences between agile and plan-driven development;
- know the key practices in extreme programming and how these relate to the general principles of agile methods;
- understand the Scrum approach to agile project management;
- be aware of the issues and problems of scaling agile development methods to the development of large software systems.
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Businesses now operate in a global, rapidly-changing environment. They have to respond to new opportunities and markets, changing economic conditions and the emergence of competing products and services. Software is part of almost all business operations so new software is developed quickly to take advantage of new opportunities and to respond to competitive pressure. Rapid development and delivery is therefore now often the most critical requirement for software systems. In fact, many businesses are willing to trade off software quality and compromise on requirements to achieve faster deployment of the software that they need.

Because these businesses are operating in a changing environment, it is often practically impossible to derive a complete set of stable software requirements. The initial requirements inevitably change because customers find it impossible to predict how a system will affect working practices, how it will interact with other systems and what user operations should be automated. It may only be after a system has been delivered and users gain experience with it that the real requirements become clear. Even then, the requirements are likely to change quickly and unpredictably due to external factors. The software may then be out-of-date when it is delivered.

Software development processes that plan on completely specifying the requirements then designing, building and testing the system are not geared to rapid software development. As the requirements change or as requirements problems are discovered, the system design or implementation has to be reworked and retested. As a consequence, a conventional waterfall or specification-based process is usually prolonged and the final software is delivered to the customer long after it was originally specified.

For some types of software, such as safety-critical control systems, where a complete analysis of the system is essential, a plan-driven approach is the right one. However, in a fast-moving business environment, this can cause real problems. By the time the software is available for use, the original reason for its procurement may have changed so radically that the software is effectively useless. Therefore, for business systems in particular, development processes that focus on rapid software development and delivery are essential.

The need for rapid system development and processes that can handle changing requirements has been recognized for some time. IBM introduced incremental development in the 1980s (Mills, et al., 1980). The introduction of so-called fourth-generation languages, also in the 1980s, supported the idea of quickly developing and delivering software (Martin, 1981). However, the notion really took off in the late 1990s with the development of the notion of agile approaches such as DSDM (Stapleton, 1997), Scrum (Schwaber and Beedle, 2001) and extreme programming (Beck, 1999,Beck, 2000).

Rapid software development processes are designed to produce useful software quickly. The software is not developed as a single unit but as a series of increments, with each increment including new system functionality. Although there are many approaches to rapid software development, they share some fundamental characteristics:

1. The processes of specification, design and implementation are inter-leaved. There is no detailed system specification, and design documentation is
minimized or generated automatically by the programming environment used to implement the system. The user requirements document only defines the most important characteristics of the system.

2. The system is developed in a series of versions. End-users and other system stakeholders are involved in specifying and evaluating each version. They may propose changes to the software and new requirements that should be implemented in a later version of the system.

3. System user interfaces are often developed using an interactive development system that allows the interface design to be quickly created by drawing and placing icons on the interface. The system may then generate a web-based interface for a browser or an interface for a specific platform such as Microsoft Windows.

Agile methods are incremental development methods in which the increments are small and, typically, new releases of the system are created and made available to customers every two or three weeks. They involve customers in the development process to get rapid feedback on changing requirements. They minimize documentation by using informal communications rather than formal meetings with written documents.

3.1 Agile methods

In the 1980s and early 1990s, there was a widespread view that the best way to achieve better software was through careful project planning, formalized quality assurance, the use of analysis and design methods supported by CASE tools, and controlled and rigorous software development processes. This view came from the software engineering community that was responsible for developing large, long-lived software systems such as aerospace and government systems.

This software was developed by large teams working for different companies. Teams were often geographically dispersed and worked on the software for long periods of time. An example of this type of software is the control systems for a modern aircraft, which might take up to 10 years from initial specification to deployment. These plan-driven approaches involve a significant overhead in planning, designing and documenting the system. This overhead is justified when the work of multiple development teams has to be coordinated, when the system is a critical system and when many different people will be involved in maintaining the software over its lifetime.

However, when this heavyweight, plan-driven development approach is applied to small and medium-sized business systems, the overhead involved is so large that it dominates the software development process. More time is spent on how the system should be developed than on program development and testing. As the system requirements change, rework is essential and, in principle at least, the specification and design has to change with the program.
Dissatisfaction with these heavyweight approaches to software engineering led a number of software developers in the 1990s to propose new ‘agile methods’. These allowed the development team to focus on the software itself rather than on its design and documentation. Agile methods universally rely on an incremental approach to software specification, development and delivery. They are best suited to application development where the system requirements usually change rapidly during the development process. They are intended to deliver working software quickly to customers, who can then propose new and changed requirements to be included in later iterations of the system. They aim to cut down on process bureaucracy by avoiding work that has dubious long-term value and eliminating documentation that will probably never be used.

The philosophy behind agile methods is reflected in the agile manifesto that was agreed by many of the leading developers of these methods. This manifesto states:

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

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

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

Probably the best-known agile method is extreme programming (Beck, 1999, Beck, 2000), which I describe later in this chapter. Other agile approaches include Scrum (Cohn, 2009, Schwaber, 2004, Schwaber and Beedle, 2001), Crystal (Cockburn, 2001, Cockburn, 2004), Adaptive Software Development (Highsmith, 2000), DSDM (Stapleton, 1997, Stapleton, 2003) and Feature Driven Development (Palmer and Felsing, 2002). The success of these methods has led to some integration with more traditional development methods based on system modelling, resulting in the notion of agile modelling (Ambler and Jeffries, 2002) and agile instantiations of the Rational Unified Process (Larman, 2002).

Although these agile methods are all based around the notion of incremental development and delivery, they propose different processes to achieve this. However, they share a set of principles, based on the agile manifesto, and so have much in common. These principles are shown in Figure 3.1. Different agile methods instantiate these principles in different ways and I don’t have space to discuss all agile methods. Instead, I focus on two of the most widely used methods, extreme programming (section 3.3) and Scrum (section 3.4).

Agile methods have been very successful for some types of system development:

1. Product development where a software company is developing a small or medium-sized product for sale.
2. Custom system development within an organization, where there is a clear commitment from the customer to become involved in the development process and where there are not a lot of external rules and regulations that affect the software.

As I discuss in the final section of this chapter, the success of agile methods has meant that there is a lot of interest in using these methods for other types of software development. However, because of their focus on small, tightly-integrated teams, there are problems in scaling them to large systems. There have also been experiments in using agile approaches for critical systems engineering (Drobna, et al., 2004). However, because of the need for security, safety and dependability analysis in critical systems, agile methods require significant modification before they can be routinely used for critical systems engineering.

In practice, the principles underlying agile methods are sometimes difficult to realize:

1. While the idea of customer involvement in the development process is an attractive one, its success depends on having a customer who is willing and able to spend time with the development team and who can represent all system stakeholders. Frequently, the customer representatives are subject to other pressures and cannot take full part in the software development.

2. Individual team members may not have suitable personalities for the intense involvement that is typical of agile methods, and therefore not interact well with other team members.
3. Prioritizing changes can be extremely difficult, especially in systems for which there are many stakeholders. Typically, each stakeholder gives different priorities to different changes.

4. Maintaining simplicity requires extra work. Under pressure from delivery schedules, the team members may not have time to carry out desirable system simplifications.

5. Many organizations, especially large companies, have spent years changing their culture so that processes are defined and followed. It is difficult for them to move to a working model in which processes are informal and defined by development teams.

Another non-technical problem – that is a general problem with incremental development and delivery – occurs when the system customer uses an outside organization for system development. The software requirements document is usually part of the contract between the customer and the supplier. Because incremental specification is inherent in agile methods, writing contracts for this type of development may be difficult.

Consequently, agile methods have to rely on contracts in which the customer pays for the time required for system development rather than the development of a specific set of requirements. So long as all goes well, this benefits both the customer and the developer. However, if problems arise then there may be difficult disputes over who is to blame and who should pay for the extra time and resources required to resolve the problems.

Most books and papers that describe agile methods and experiences with agile methods talk about the use of these methods for new systems development. However, as I explain in Chapter 9, a huge amount of software engineering effort goes into the maintenance and evolution of existing software systems. There are only a small number of experience reports on using agile methods for software maintenance (Poole and Huisman, 2001). There are two questions that should be considered when considering agile methods and maintenance:

1. Are systems that are developed using an agile approach maintainable, given the emphasis in the development process of minimizing formal documentation?

2. Can agile methods be used effectively for evolving a system in response to customer change requests?

Formal documentation is supposed to describe the system and so make it easier for people changing the system to understand. In practice, however, formal documentation is often not kept up-to-date and so does not accurately reflect the program code. For this reason, agile methods enthusiasts argue that it is a waste of time to write this documentation and that the key to implementing maintainable software is to produce high-quality, readable code. Agile practices therefore emphasize the importance of writing well-structured code and investing effort in code improvement. Therefore, the lack of documentation should not be a problem in maintaining systems developed using an agile approach.
However, my experience of system maintenance suggests that the key document is the system requirements document, which tells the software engineer what the system is supposed to do. Without such knowledge, it is difficult to assess the impact of proposed system changes. Many agile methods collect requirements informally and incrementally and do not create a coherent requirements document. In this respect, the use of agile methods is likely to make subsequent system maintenance more difficult and expensive.

Agile practices, used in the maintenance process itself, are likely to be effective, whether or not an agile approach has been used for system development. Incremental delivery, design for change and maintaining simplicity all make sense when software is being changed. In fact, you can think of an agile development process as a process of software evolution.

However, the main difficulty after software delivery is likely to be keeping customers involved in the process. While a customer may be able to justify the full-time involvement of a representative during system development, this is less likely during maintenance where changes are not continuous. Customer representatives are likely to lose interest in the system. Therefore, it is likely that alternative mechanisms, such as change proposals, discussed in Chapter 25, will be required to create the new system requirements.

The other problem that is likely to arise is maintaining continuity of the development team. Agile methods rely on team members understanding aspects of the system without having to consult documentation. If an agile development team is broken up, then this implicit knowledge is lost and it is difficult for new team members to build up the same understanding of the system and its components.

Supporters of agile methods have been evangelical in promoting their use and have tended to overlook their shortcomings. This has prompted an equally extreme response, which, in my view, exaggerates the problems with this approach (Stephens and Rosenberg, 2003). More reasoned critics such as DeMarco and Boehm (DeMarco and Boehm, 2002) highlight both the advantages and disadvantages of agile methods. They propose a hybrid approach where agile methods incorporate some techniques from plan-driven development may be the best way forward.

### 3.2 Plan-driven and agile development

Agile approaches to software development consider design and implementation to be the central activities in the software process. They incorporate other activities, such as requirements elicitation and testing, into design and implementation. By contrast, a plan-driven approach to software engineering identifies separate stages in the software process with outputs associated with each stage. The outputs from one stage are used as a basis for planning the following process activity. Figure 3.2 shows the distinctions between plan-driven and agile approaches to system specification.
In a plan-driven approach, iteration occurs within activities with formal documents used to communicate between stages of the process. For example, the requirements will evolve and, ultimately, a requirements specification will be produced. This is then an input to the design and implementation process. In an agile approach, iteration occurs across activities. Therefore, the requirements and the design are developed together, rather than separately.

A plan-driven software process can support incremental development and delivery. It is perfectly feasible to allocate requirements and plan the design and development phase as a series of increments. An agile process is not inevitably code-focused and it may produce some design documentation. As I discuss in the following section, the agile development team may decide to include a documentation ‘spike’, where, instead of producing a new version of a system, the team produce system documentation.

In fact, most software projects include practices from plan-driven and agile approaches. To decide on the balance between a plan-based and an agile approach, you have to answer a range of technical, human and organizational questions:

1. Is it important to have a very detailed specification and design before moving to implementation? If so, you probably need to use a plan-driven approach.
2. Is an incremental delivery strategy, where you deliver the software to customers and get rapid feedback from them, realistic? If so, consider using agile methods.
3. How large is the system that is being developed? Agile methods are most effective when the system can be developed with a small co-located team
who can communicate informally. This may not be possible for large systems that require larger development teams so a plan-driven approach may have to be used.

4. What type of system is being developed? Systems that require a lot of analysis before implementation (e.g. real-time system with complex timing requirements) usually need a fairly detailed design to carry out this analysis. A plan-driven approach may be best in those circumstances.

5. What is the expected system lifetime? Long-lifetime systems may require more design documentation to communicate the original intentions of the system developers to the support team. However, supporters of agile methods rightly argue that documentation is frequently not kept up to date and it is not of much use for long-term system maintenance.

6. What technologies are available to support system development? Agile methods often rely on good tools to keep track of an evolving design. If you are developing a system using an IDE that does not have good tools for program visualization and analysis, then more design documentation may be required.

7. How is the development team organized? If the development team is distributed or if part of the development is being outsourced, then you may need to develop design documents to communicate across the development teams. You may need to plan in advance what these are.

8. Are there cultural issues that may affect the system development? Traditional engineering organizations have a culture of plan-based development, as this is the norm in engineering. This usually requires extensive design documentation, rather than the informal knowledge used in agile processes.

9. How good are the designers and programmers in the development team? It is sometimes argued that agile methods require higher skill levels than plan-based approaches in which programmers simply translate a detailed design into code. If you have a team with relatively low skill levels, you may need to use the best people to develop the design, with others responsible for programming.

10. Is the system subject to external regulation? If a system has to be approved by an external regulator (e.g. the FAA approve software that is critical to the operation of an aircraft) then you will probably be required to produce detailed documentation as part of the system safety case.

In reality, the issue of whether a project can be labelled as plan-driven or agile is not very important. Ultimately, the primary concern of buyers of a software system is whether or not they have an executable software system that meets their needs and does useful things for the individual user or the organization. In practice, many companies who claim to have used agile methods have adopted some agile practices and have integrated these with their plan-driven processes.
3.3 Extreme programming

Extreme programming (XP) is perhaps the best known and most widely used of the agile methods. The name was coined by Beck (Beck, 2000) because the approach was developed by pushing recognized good practice, such as iterative development, to ‘extreme’ levels. For example, in XP, several new versions of a system may be developed by different programmers, integrated and tested in a day.

In extreme programming, requirements are expressed as scenarios (called user stories), which are implemented directly as a series of tasks. Programmers work in pairs and develop tests for each task before writing the code. All tests must be successfully executed when new code is integrated into the system. There is a short time gap between releases of the system. Figure 3.3 illustrates the XP process to produce an increment of the system that is being developed.

Extreme programming involves a number of practices, summarized in Figure 3.4, which reflect the principles of agile methods:

1. Incremental development is supported through small, frequent releases of the system. Requirements are based on simple customer stories or scenarios that are used as a basis for deciding what functionality should be included in a system increment.

2. Customer involvement is supported through the continuous engagement of the customer in the development team. The customer representative takes part in the development and is responsible for defining acceptance tests for the system.

3. People, not process, are supported through pair programming, collective ownership of the system code and a sustainable development process that does not involve excessively long working hours.

4. Change is embraced through regular system releases to customers, test-first development, refactoring to avoid code degeneration and continuous integration of new functionality.
5. Maintaining simplicity is supported by constant refactoring that improves code quality and by using simple designs that do not unnecessarily anticipate future changes to the system.

In an XP process, customers are intimately involved in specifying and prioritizing system requirements. The requirements are not specified as lists of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle or practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental planning</td>
<td>Requirements are recorded on ‘story cards’ and the stories to be included in a release are determined by the time available and their relative priority. The developers break these Stories into development ‘tasks’. See Figures 3.5 and 3.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small releases</td>
<td>The minimal useful set of functionality that provides business value is developed first. Releases of the system are frequent and incrementally add functionality to the first release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple design</td>
<td>Enough design is carried out to meet the current requirements and no more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test first development</td>
<td>An automated unit test framework is used to write tests for a new piece of functionality before that functionality itself is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refactoring</td>
<td>All developers are expected to refactor the code continuously as soon as potential code improvements are found. This keeps the code simple and maintainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair programming</td>
<td>Developers work in pairs, checking each other’s work and providing the support to always do a good job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective ownership</td>
<td>The pairs of developers work on all areas of the system, so that no islands of expertise develop and all the developers take responsibility for all of the code. Anyone can change anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous integration</td>
<td>As soon as the work on a task is complete, it is integrated into the whole system. After any such integration, all the unit tests in the system must pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable pace</td>
<td>Large amounts of overtime are not considered acceptable as the net effect is often to reduce code quality and medium-term productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site customer</td>
<td>A representative of the end user of the system (the Customer) should be available full-time for the use of the XP team. In an extreme programming process, the customer is a member of the development team and is responsible for bringing system requirements to the team for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.4 Extreme programming practices
required system functions. Rather, the system customer is part of the development team and discusses scenarios with other team members. Together, they develop a ‘story card’ that encapsulates the customer needs. The development team then aims to implement that scenario in a future release of the software. An example of a story card for the mental health care patient management system is shown in Figure 3.5. This is a short description of a scenario for prescribing medication for a patient.

The story cards are the main inputs to the XP planning process or the ‘planning game’. Once the story cards have been developed, the development team breaks these down into tasks (Figure 3.6) and estimates the effort and resources required for implementing each task. This usually involves discussions with the customer to refine the requirements. The customer then prioritizes the stories for implementation, choosing those stories that can be used immediately to deliver useful business support. The intention is to identify useful functionality that can be implemented in about two weeks, when the next release of the system is made available to the customer.

Of course, as requirements change, the unimplemented stories change or may be discarded. If changes are required for a system that has already been delivered, new story cards are developed and again, the customer decides whether these changes should have priority over new functionality.

Sometimes, during the planning game, questions that cannot be easily answered come to light and additional work is required to explore possible
solutions. The team may carry out some prototyping or trial development to understand the problem and solution. In XP terms, this is a ‘spike’, an increment where no programming is done. There may also be ‘spikes’ to design the system architecture or to develop system documentation.

Extreme programming takes an ‘extreme’ approach to incremental development. New versions of the software may be built several times per day and releases are delivered to customers roughly every two weeks. Release deadlines are never slipped; if there are development problems, the customer is consulted and functionality is removed from the planned release.

When a programmer builds the system to create a new version, he or she must run all existing automated tests as well as the tests for the new functionality. The new build of the software is accepted only if all tests execute successfully. This then becomes the basis for the next iteration of the system.

A fundamental precept of traditional software engineering is that you should design for change. That is, you should anticipate future changes to the software and design it so that these changes can be easily implemented. Extreme programming, however, has discarded this principle on the basis that designing for change is often wasted effort. It isn’t worth taking time to add generality to a program to cope with change. The changes anticipated often never materialize and completely different change requests may actually be made. Therefore, the XP approach accepts that changes will happen and re-organize the software when these changes actually occur.

A general problem with incremental development is that it tends to degrade the software structure, so changes to the software become harder and harder to implement. Essentially, the development proceeds by finding workarounds to problems, with the result that code is often duplicated, parts of the software are reused in inappropriate ways, and the overall structure degrades as code is added to the system.

Extreme programming tackles this problem by suggesting that the software should be constantly refactored. This means that the programming team look for
possible improvements to the software and implement them immediately. When a team member sees code that can be improved, they make these improvements even in situations where there is no immediate need for them. Examples of refactoring include the re-organization of a class hierarchy to remove duplicate code, the tidying up and renaming of attributes and methods, and the replacement of code with calls to methods defined in a program library. Program development environments, such as Eclipse (Carlson, 2005), include tools for refactoring which simplify the process of finding dependencies between code sections and making global code modifications.

In principle then, the software should always be easy to understand and change as new stories are implemented. In practice, this is not always the case. Sometimes development pressure means that refactoring is delayed because the time is devoted to the implementation of new functionality. Some new features and changes cannot readily be accommodated by code-level refactoring and require the architecture of the system to be modified.

In practice, many companies that have adopted XP do not use all of the extreme programming practices listed in Figure 3.4. They pick and choose according to their local ways of working. For example, some companies find pair programming helpful, others prefer to use individual programming and reviews. To accommodate different levels of skill, some programmers don’t do refactoring in parts of the system they did not develop, and conventional requirements may be used rather than user stories. However, most companies who have adopted an XP variant use small releases, test-first development and continuous integration.

3.3.1 Testing in XP

As I discussed in the introduction to this chapter, one of the important differences between incremental development and plan-driven development is in the way that the system is tested. With incremental development, there is no system specification that can be used by an external testing team to develop system tests. As a consequence, some approaches to incremental development have a very informal testing process, in comparison with plan-driven testing.

To avoid some of the problems of testing and system validation, XP emphasizes the importance of program testing. XP includes an approach to testing that reduces the chances of introducing undiscovered errors into the current version of the system.

The key features of testing in XP are:

1. Test-first development,
2. incremental test development from scenarios,
3. user involvement in the test development and validation,
4. the use of automated testing frameworks.

Test-first development is one of the most important innovations in XP. Instead of writing some code then writing tests for that code, you write the tests
before you write the code. This means that you can run the test as the code is being written and discover problems during development.

Writing tests implicitly defines both an interface and a specification of behaviour for the functionality being developed. Problems of requirements and interface misunderstandings are reduced. This approach can be adopted in any process in which there is a clear relationship between a system requirement and the code implementing that requirement. In XP, you can always see this link because the story cards representing the requirements are broken down into tasks and the tasks are the principal unit of implementation. The adoption of test-first development in XP has led to more general test-driven approaches to development (Astels, 2003). I discuss these in Chapter 8.

In test-first development, the task implementers have to thoroughly understand the specification so that they can write tests for the system. This means that ambiguities and omissions in the specification have to be clarified before implementation begins. Furthermore, it also avoids the problem of ‘test-lag’. This may happen when the developer of the system works at a faster pace than the tester. The implementation gets further and further ahead of the testing and there is a tendency to skip tests, so that the development schedule can be maintained.

User requirements in XP are expressed as scenarios or stories and the user prioritizes these for development. The development team assesses each scenario and breaks it down into tasks. For example, some of the task cards developed from the story card for prescribing medication (Figure 3.5) are shown in Figure 3.6. Each task generates one or more unit tests that check the implementation described in that task. Figure 3.7 is a shortened description of a test case that has been developed to check that the prescribed dose of a drug does not fall outside known safe limits.

The role of the customer in the testing process is to help develop acceptance tests for the stories that are to be implemented in the next release of the system. As I discuss in Chapter 8, acceptance testing is the process where the system is tested using customer data to check that it meets the customer’s real needs.
In XP, acceptance testing, like development, is incremental. The customer who is part of the team writes tests as development proceeds. All new code is therefore validated to ensure that it is what the customer needs. For the story in Figure 3.5, the acceptance test would involve scenarios where (a) the dose of a drug was changed, (b) a new drug was selected and (c) the formulary was used to find a drug. In practice, a series of acceptance tests rather than a single test are normally required.

Relying on the customer to support acceptance test development is sometimes a major difficulty in the XP testing process. People adopting the customer role have very limited available time and may not be able to work full-time with the development team. The customer may feel that providing the requirements was enough of a contribution and so may be reluctant to get involved in the testing process.

Test automation is essential for test-first development. Tests are written as executable components before the task is implemented. These testing components should be stand-alone, should simulate the submission of input to be tested and should check that the result meets the output specification. An automated test framework is a system that makes it easy to write executable tests and submit a set of tests for execution. Junit (Massol and Husted, 2003) is a widely used example of an automated testing framework.

As testing is automated, there is always a set of tests that can be quickly and easily executed. Whenever any functionality is added to the system, the tests can be run and problems that the new code has introduced can be caught immediately.

Test-first development and automated testing usually results in a large number of tests being written and executed. However, this approach does not necessarily lead to thorough program testing. There are 3 reasons for this:

1. Programmers prefer programming to testing and sometimes they take short cuts when writing tests. For example, they may write incomplete tests that do not check for all possible exceptions that may occur.

2. Some tests can be very difficult to write incrementally. For example, in a complex user interface, it is often difficult to write unit tests for the code that implements the ‘display logic’ and workflow between screens.

3. It difficult to judge the completeness of a set of tests. Although you may have a lot of system tests, your test set may not provide complete coverage. Crucial parts of the system may not be executed and so remain untested.

Therefore, although a large set of frequently executed tests may give the impression that the system is complete and correct, this may not be the case. If the tests are not reviewed and further tests written after development, then undetected bugs may be delivered in the system release.

### 3.3.2 Pair programming

Another innovative practice that has been introduced in XP is that programmers work in pairs to develop the software. They actually sit together at the same
workstation to develop the software. However, the same pair do not always
program together. Rather pairs are created dynamically so that all team members
work with each other during the development process.

The use of pair programming has a number of advantages:

1. It supports the idea of collective ownership and responsibility for the
   system. This reflects Weinberg’s idea of egoless programming (Weinberg,
   1971) where the software is owned by the team as a whole and individuals
   are not held responsible for problems with the code. Instead, the team has
   collective responsibility for resolving these problems.

2. It acts as an informal review process because each line of code is looked at
   by at least two people. Code inspections and reviews (covered in Chapter
   24) are very successful in discovering a high percentage of software errors.
   However, they are time consuming to organize and, typically, introduce
   delays into the development process. While pair programming is a less
   formal process that probably doesn’t find as many errors as code
   inspections, it is a much cheaper inspection process than formal program
   inspections.

3. It helps support refactoring, which is a process of software improvement.
   The difficulty of implementing this in a normal development environment is
   that effort in refactoring is expended for long-term benefit. An individual
   who practices refactoring may be judged to be less efficient than one who
   simply carries on developing code. Where pair programming and collective
   ownership are used, others benefit immediately from the refactoring so they
   are likely to support the process.

   You might think that pair programming would be less efficient than
   individual programming. In a given time, a pair of developers would produce half
   as much code as two individuals working alone. There have been various studies of
   the productivity of paid programmers with mixed results. Using student volunteers,
   Williams and her collaborators (Cockburn and Williams, 2001, Williams, et al.,
   2000) found that productivity with pair programming seems to be comparable with
   that of two people working independently. The reasons suggested are that pairs
   discuss the software before development so probably have fewer false starts and
   less rework. Furthermore, the number of errors avoided by the informal inspection
   is such that less time is spent repairing bugs discovered during the testing process.

   However, studies with more experienced programmers (Arisholm, et al.,
   2007, Parrish, et al., 2004) did not replicate these results. They found that there was
   a significant loss of productivity compared with 2 programmers working alone.
   There were some quality benefits but these did not fully compensate for the pair-
   programming overhead. Nevertheless, the sharing of knowledge that happens
   during pair programming is very important as it reduces the overall risks to a
   project when team members leave. In itself, this may make pair programming
   worthwhile.
The principal responsibility of software project managers is to manage the project so that the software is delivered on time and within the planned budget for the project. They supervise the work of software engineers and monitor how well the software development is progressing.

The standard approach to project management is plan-driven. As I discuss in Chapter 23, managers draw up a plan for the project showing what should be delivered, when it should be delivered and who will work on the development of the project deliverables. A plan-based approach really requires a manager to have a stable view of everything that has to be developed and the development processes. However, it does not work well with agile methods where the requirements are developed incrementally, where the software is delivered in short, rapid increments and where changes to the requirements and the software are the norm.

Like every other professional software development process, agile development has to be managed so that the best use is made of the time and resources available to the team. This requires a different approach to project management, which is adapted to incremental development and the particular strengths of agile methods.

The Scrum approach (Schwaber, 2004, Schwaber and Beedle, 2001) is a general agile method but its focus is on managing iterative development rather than specific technical approaches to agile software engineering. Figure 3.8 is a diagram of the Scrum management process. Scrum does not prescribe the use of programming practices such as pair programming and test-first development. It can therefore be used with more technical agile approaches, such as XP, to provide a management framework for the project.

There are three phases in Scrum. The first is an outline planning phase where you establish the general objectives for the project and design the software architecture. This is followed by a series of sprint cycles, where each cycle develops an increment of the system. Finally, the project closure phase wraps up the project, completes required documentation such as system help frames and user manuals and assesses the lessons learned from the project.

3.4 Agile Project Management
The innovative feature of Scrum is its central phase, namely the sprint cycles. A Scrum sprint is a planning unit in which the work to be done is assessed, features are selected for development, and the software is implemented. At the end of a sprint, the completed functionality is delivered to stakeholders. Key characteristics of this process are as follows:

1. Sprints are fixed length, normally 2–4 weeks. They correspond to the development of a release of the system in XP.

2. The starting point for planning is the product backlog, which is the list of work to be done on the project. During the assessment phase of the sprint, this is reviewed, and priorities and risks are assigned. The customer is closely involved in this process and can introduce new requirements or tasks at the beginning of each sprint.

3. The selection phase involves all of the project team who work with the customer to select the features and functionality to be developed during the sprint.

4. Once these are agreed, the team organize themselves to develop the software. Short daily meetings involving all team members are held to review progress and if necessary, re-prioritize work. During this stage the team is isolated from the customer and the organization, with all communications channelled through the so-called ‘Scrum master’. The role of the Scrum master is to protect the development team from external distractions. The way in which the work is done depends on the problem and the team. Unlike XP, Scrum does not make specific suggestions on how to write requirements, test-first development, etc. However, these XP practices can be used if the team thinks they are appropriate.

5. At the end of the sprint, the work done is reviewed and presented to stakeholders. The next sprint cycle then begins.

The idea behind Scrum is that the whole team should be empowered to make decisions so the term ‘project manager’, has been deliberately avoided. Rather, the ‘Scrum master’ is a facilitator who arranges daily meetings, tracks the backlog of work to be done, records decisions, measures progress against the backlog and communicates with customers and management outside of the team.

The whole team attends the daily meetings, which are sometimes ‘stand-up’ meetings to keep them short and focused. During the meeting, all team members share information, describe their progress since the last meeting, problems that have arisen and what is planned for the following day. This means that everyone on the team knows what is going on and, if problems arise, can re-plan short-term work to cope with them. Everyone participates in this short-term planning — there is no top-down direction from the Scrum master.

There are many anecdotal reports of the successful use of Scrum available on the web. Rising and Janoff (Rising and Janoff, 2000) discuss its successful use in a telecommunication software development environment, and they list its advantages as follows:
1. The product is broken down into a set of manageable and understandable chunks.

2. Unstable requirements do not hold up progress.

3. The whole team have visibility of everything and consequently team communication is improved.

4. Customers see on-time delivery of increments and gain feedback on how the product works.

5. Trust between customers and developers is established and a positive culture is created in which everyone expects the project to succeed.

Scrum, as originally designed, was intended for use with co-located teams where all team members could get together every day in stand-up meetings. However, much software development now involves distributed teams with team members located in different places around the world. Consequently, there are various experiments going on to develop Scrum for distributed development environments (Smits and Pshigoda, 2007, Sutherland, et al., 2007).

### 3.5 Scaling Agile Methods

Agile methods were developed for use by small programming teams who could work together in the same room and communicate informally. Agile methods have therefore been mostly used for the development of small and medium sized systems. Of course, the need for faster delivery of software, which is more suited to customer needs, also applies to larger systems. Consequently, there has been a great deal of interest in scaling agile methods to cope with larger systems, developed by large organizations.

Denning et al. (Denning, et al., 2008) argue that the only way to avoid common software engineering problems, such as systems that don’t meet customer needs and budget overruns, is to find ways of making agile methods work for large systems. Leffingwell (Leffingwell, 2007) discusses which agile practices scale to large systems development. Moore and Spens (Moore and Spens, 2008) report on their experience of using an agile approach to develop a large medical system with 300 developers working in geographically-distributed teams.

Large software system development is different from small system development in a number of ways:

1. Large systems are usually collections of separate, communicating systems, where separate teams develop each system. Frequently, these teams are working in different places, sometimes in different time zones. It is practically impossible for each team to have a view of the whole system. Consequently, their priorities are usually to complete their part of the system without regard for wider systems issues.
2. Large systems are ‘brownfield systems’ (Hopkins and Jenkins, 2008), that is they include and interact with a number of existing systems. Many of the system requirements are concerned with this interaction and so don’t really lend themselves to flexibility and incremental development. Political issues can also be significant here – often the easiest solution to a problem is to change an existing system. However, this requires negotiation with the managers of that system to convince them that the changes can be implemented without risk to the system’s operation.

3. Where several systems are integrated to create a system, a significant fraction of the development is concerned with system configuration rather than original code development. This is not necessarily compatible with incremental development and frequent system integration.

4. Large systems and their development processes are often constrained by external rules and regulations limiting the way that they can be developed, that require certain types of system documentation to be produced, etc.

5. Large systems have a long procurement and development time. It is difficult to maintain coherent teams who know about the system over that period as, inevitably, people move on to other jobs and projects.

6. Large systems usually have a diverse set of stakeholders. For example, nurses and administrators may be the end users of a medical system but senior medical staff, hospital managers, etc. are also stakeholders in the system. It is practically impossible to involve all of these different stakeholders in the development process.

There are two perspectives on the scaling of agile methods:

1. A ‘scaling up’ perspective, which is concerned with using these methods for developing large software systems that cannot be developed by a small team.

2. A ‘scaling out’ perspective, which is concerned with how agile methods can be introduced across a large organization with many years of software development experience.

Agile methods have to be adapted to cope with large systems engineering. Leffingwell (Leffingwell, 2007) argues that it is essential to maintain the fundamentals of agile methods – flexible planning, frequent system releases, continuous integration, test-driven development and good team communications. I believe that the critical adaptations that have to be introduced are as follows:

1. For large systems development, it is not possible to focus only on the code of the system. You need to do more up-front design and system documentation. The software architecture has to be designed and there has to be documentation produced to describe critical aspects of the system, such as database schemas, the work breakdown across teams, etc.
2. Cross-team communication mechanisms have to be designed and used. This should involve regular phone and video conferences between team members and frequent, short electronic meetings where teams update each other on progress. A range of communication channels such as email, instant messaging, wikis, and social networking systems should be provided to facilitate communications.

3. Continuous integration, where the whole system is built every time any developer checks in a change, is practically impossible when several separate programs have to be integrated to create the system. However, it is essential to maintain frequent system builds and regular releases of the system. This may mean that new configuration management tools that support multi-team software development, have to be introduced.

Small software companies that develop software products have been amongst the most enthusiastic adopters of agile methods. These companies are not constrained by organizational bureaucracies or process standards and they can change quickly to adopt new ideas. Of course, larger companies have also experimented with agile methods in specific projects, but it is much more difficult for them to ‘scale out’ these methods across the organization. Lindvall et al (Lindvall, et al., 2004) discuss some of the problems in scaling-out agile methods in four large technology companies.

It is difficult to introduce agile methods into large companies for a number of reasons:

1. Project managers who do not have experience of agile methods may be reluctant to accept the risk of a new approach, as they do not know how this will affect their particular projects.

2. Large organizations often have quality procedures and standards that all projects are expected to follow and, because of their bureaucratic nature, these are likely to be incompatible with agile methods. Sometimes, these are supported by software tools (e.g. requirements management tools) and the use of these tools is mandated for all projects.

3. Agile methods seem to work best when team members have a relatively high skill level. However, within large organizations, there are likely to be a wide range of skills and abilities, and people with lower skill levels may not be effective team members in agile processes.

4. There may be cultural resistance to agile methods, especially in those organizations that have a long history of using conventional systems engineering processes.

Change management and testing procedures are examples of company procedures that may not be compatible with agile methods. Change management is the process of controlling changes to a system, so that the impact of changes is predictable and costs are controlled. All changes have to be approved in advance before they are made and this conflicts with the notion of refactoring. In XP, any developer can improve any code without getting external approval. For large
systems, there are also testing standards where a system build is handed over to an external testing team. This may conflict with the test-first and test-often approaches used in XP.

Introducing and sustaining the use of agile methods across a large organization is a process of cultural change. Cultural change takes a long time to implement and often requires a change of management before it can be accomplished. Companies wishing to use agile methods need evangelists to promote change. They must devote significant resources to the change process. At the time of writing, few large companies have made a successful transition to agile development across the organization.

**KEY POINTS**

Agile methods are incremental development methods that focus on rapid development, frequent releases of the software, reducing process overheads and producing high-quality code. They involve the customer directly in the development process.

The decision on whether to use an agile or a plan-driven approach to development should depend on the type of software being developed, the capabilities of the development team and the culture of the company developing the system.

Extreme programming is a well-known agile method that integrates a range of good programming practices such as frequent releases of the software, continuous software improvement and customer participation in the development team.

A particular strength of extreme programming is the development of automated tests before a program feature is created. All tests must successfully execute when an increment is integrated into a system.

The Scrum method is an agile method that provides a project management framework. It is centred round a set of sprints, which are fixed time periods when a system increment is developed. Planning is based on prioritizing a backlog of work and selecting the highest priority tasks for a sprint.

Scaling agile methods for large systems is difficult. Large systems need up-front design and some documentation. Continuous integration is practically impossible when there are several separate development teams working on a project.

**FURTHER READING**

*Extreme Programming Explained.* This was the first book on XP and is still, perhaps, the most readable. It explains the approach from the perspective of one of its
inventors and his enthusiasm comes through very clearly in the book. (Kent Beck, Addison-Wesley, 2000)

‘Get Ready for Agile Methods, With Care’. A thoughtful critique of agile methods that discusses their strengths and weaknesses, written by a vastly experienced software engineer. (B. Boehm, IEEE Computer, January 2002)
http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/2.976920

Scaling Software Agility: Best Practices for Large Enterprises. Although focused on issues of scaling agile development, this book also includes a summary of the principal agile methods such as XP, Scrum and Crystal. (D. Leffingwell, Addison-Wesley, 2007)

Running an Agile Software Development Project. Most books on agile methods focus on a specific method but this book takes a different approach and discusses how to put XP into practice in a project. Good, practical advice. (M. Holcombe, John Wiley and Sons, 2008)

EXERCISES

3.1 Explain why the rapid delivery and deployment of new systems is often more important to businesses than the detailed functionality of these systems.

3.2 Explain how the principles underlying agile methods lead to the accelerated development and deployment of software.

3.3 When would you recommend against the use of an agile method for developing a software system?

3.4 Extreme programming expresses user requirements as stories, with each story written on a card. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this approach to requirements description.

3.5 Explain why test-first development helps the programmer to develop a better understanding of the system requirements. What are the potential difficulties with test-first development?

3.6 Suggest four reasons why the productivity rate of programmers working as a pair might be more than half that of two programmers working individually.

3.7 Compare and contrast the Scrum approach to project management with conventional plan-based approaches as discussed in Chapter 23. The comparisons should be based on the effectiveness of each approach for planning the allocation of people to projects, estimating the cost of projects, maintaining team cohesion and managing changes in project team membership.

3.8 You are a software manager in a company that develops critical control software for aircraft. You are responsible for the development of a software design support system that supports the translation of software requirements to a formal software specification (discussed in Chapter 13). Comment on the advantages and disadvantages of the following development strategies:

a. Collect the requirements for such a system from software engineers and external stakeholders (such as the regulatory certification authority) and develop the system using a plan-driven approach.
b. Develop a prototype using a scripting language such as Ruby or Python, evaluate this prototype with software engineers and other stakeholders, then review the system requirements. Re-develop the final system using Java.

c. Develop the system in Java using an agile approach with a user involved in the development team.

3.9 It has been suggested that one of the problems of having a user closely involved with a software development team is that they 'go native'. That is, they adopt the outlook of the development team and lose sight of the needs of their user colleagues. Suggest three ways how you might avoid this problem and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

3.10 To reduce costs and the environmental impact of commuting, your company decides to close a number of offices and to provide support for staff to work from home. However, the senior management who introduce the policy are unaware that software is developed using agile methods, which rely on close team working and pair programming, are used. Discuss the difficulties that this new policy might cause and how you might get around these problems.
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