Technical Excellence in Software Development

Prof. Ingrid Nunes Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)

Série de Seminários do INF + CEI-Talks











R. L. Glass, "Greece vs. Rome: Two Very Different Software Cultures," in IEEE Software, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 112-112, Nov.-Dec. 2006.doi: 10.1109/MS.2006.163

Software Development



• But...



Ah 2018.

Scrum means "Waterfall but we don't have time for analysis".

Kanban means "Scrum, but we don't have time for sprint planning".

Agile means "We have no process, but we do use TOOL extensively"

11:29 PM · 12 Aug 18

1,080 Retweets 2,635 Likes



Software Development



...



Stack Overflow @StackOverflow

. @rla4, the tech lead on Stack Overflow for Teams, explains why we ignored several best practices when building Stack Overflow's public site 12 years ago, and how we're modernizing our codebase to be approachable and powerful today.



The Stack Overflow Podcast We chat with Roberta Arcoverde, the tech lead on Stack Overflow for Teams. She explains why we ignored several ... & the-stack-overflow-podcast.simplecast.com

5:40 PM · Mar 30, 2021 · Hootsuite Inc.

https://the-stack-overflow-podcast.simplecast.com/episodes/code-base-clean-modern-roberta-arcoverde



•Software Development



• What does not work?

I.) To adopt an approach without knowing it or adapt it, when it is required

- 2. To adopt an approach ignoring what is key for it to work
 - 3.) To consider something as does with no guarantees that it has been done as it should be

EV FIZ OS TESTES UNITÁPUOS ASS. DEV PS.É VERDADE ESSE BILHETE





class UserController {

```
createUser() {
// check data valid
new User()
```

```
}
```

```
resetPassword() {

// check token valid

// check pw valid

user.setPassword(newPVV)
```

class User {				
	login password			
	//getters			
	//setters			
}				

Is there any problem in this code?















 Effective use of object orientation

```
class UserController {
```

```
createUser() {
    new User()
```

```
resetPassword() {
    user.resetPassword(newPW)
}
```

```
class User {
  login
  password
  User () \{
     setPassword()
  setPassword() {
     //check pw valid
  resetPassword() {
      isTokenValid()
      setPassword()
  isTokenValid() { ... }
```





- Rules and Principles
 - Bertrand Meyer. 1988.
 Object-Oriented Software Construction.
 - Modularity Rules
 - Direct Mapping
 - Few Interfaces
 - Small interfaces (weak coupling)
 - Explicit Interfaces
 - Information Hiding
 - Modularity Principles
 - Linguistic Modular Units
 - Self-Documentation
 - Uniform Access
 - Open-Closed
 - Single Choice
- O • Sii



10

- Principles S.O.L.I.D.
 - Robert C. Martin. 2008. Clean Code: A Handbook of Agile Software Craftsmanship.
 - **S**ingle Responsibility Principles
 - Open-Closed Principle
 - Liskov Substitution Principle
 - Interface Segregation Principle
 - **D**ependency Inversion Principle



- GRASP Patterns
 - E.g. Specialist
 - Craig Larman. 1997. Applying UML and Patterns: An Introduction to Object-Oriented Analysis and Design and Iterative Development.
- Code Smells / Refactoring Catalog
 - E.g.
 - Feature Envy
 - Data Class
 - Martin Fowler. 1999. Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code.















04/04/2021

Ingrid Nunes <ingridnunes@inf.ufrgs.br>



•CBSoft 2014 – David Parnas







http://cbsoft2021.joinville.udesc.br/



04/04/2021



Software Architecture



• Fundamental for an organised software evolution



- I. Modules
- 2. Dependencies
- 3. Module roles

Consistency between the conceptual and implemented architecture!



Software Architecture



• Fundamental for an organised software evolution





•Software Architecture



• Architecture Recovery



software dependencies





04/04/2021

Software Architecture



- WGB Method
 - Dependencies

 +
 MDS Metric
 +

 Optimisation

 Problem





ZAPALOWSKI, V. ; NUNES, I. ; NUNES, D. . The WGB method to recover implemented architectural rules. INFORMATION AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY, v. 103, p. 125-137, 2018.

Code Review





- Advantage
 - Avoid problem 3:To consider something as does with no guarantees that it has been done as it should be



Code Review



- Some facts (most derived from OSS)
 - Average of I-2 reviewers and 2-3 comments per request
 - Newcomers tend to receive more attention
 - Small code changes and long descriptions facilitate the review
 - Most frequent discussion topics
 - Code improvement
 - Understanding
 - Social interactions
- MCR and pair programming are interchangeable in terms of cost
 - When pair programming is adopted within test-driven development, MCR has lower cost
 - Unit testing: finds more failures
 - MCR: less time in the detection and isolation of the underlying sources of the defects
- Most common type of support
 - Reviewer recommenders and visualizations of code changes



DAVILA, N. ; NUNES, I. . A Systematic Literature Review and Taxonomy of Modern Code Review. The Journal of Systems & Software, 2021.

UFRGS

- Metaphor created by Ward Cunningham to justify for non-technical stakeholders the need for refactoring
- Some problems in the code are like financial debt. It is ok to make a loan, as long as it is paid.

Technical debt management is crucial! It must be paid.





•Technical Debt

•Technical Debt





© www.SoftwareTestingHelp.com



•Technical Debt



Reasons for TD introduction at the code level

- From the self perspective
 - Tight schedule
 - Work overload
 - Pressure from the management
- From the perspective of other developers
 - Also development and technology inexperience



ROCHA, J. C. ; ZAPALOWSKI, V. ; NUNES, I. . Understanding Technical Debt at the Code Level from the Perspective of Software Developers. In: Brazilian Symposium on Software Engineering, 2017.

Practices that should be adopted to avoid TD



Metrics and Static Analysis Tools



- Code Metrics
 - Traditional: LOC, Fan-in, Fan-out, Cyclomatic Complexity, ...
 - CK Metrics: DIT, WMC, RFC, CBO, LCOM, NOC





Metrics and Static Analysis Tools



- Code Metrics
 - Traditional: LOC, Fan-in, Fan-out, Cyclomatic Complexity, ...
 - CK Metrics: DIT, WMC, RFC, CBO, LCOM, NOC
- Static Analysis Tools
 - Automatically checking of common problems
 - Use of rules
 - Dependencies, code smell detections
 - Part of automated reviewers



Metrics and Static Analysis Tools



"You can't manage what you can't measure",

Tom DeMarco

- Experimental Software Engineering
- GQM
 - Framework for systematic measurement, data collection, and analysis
 - GOAL
 - Measurement objects can be products, processes and resources
 - QUESTION
 - Characterisation of the questions aligned with the objectives
 - METRIC
 - Measurements to answer the specified questions



Based on Basili, V. R., Caldiera, G., and Rombach, H. D. (1990) The Goal Question Inletric Approach



V. Basili, R. Selby, and D. Hutchens. 1986. Experimentation in software engineering. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.* 12, 7 (July 1986), 733-743.

Software Logging and Monitoring



- What is logging?
 - It is the practice of **recording relevant information** about a running system
 - Logging statements



- Be precise, concise and consistent in logging statements
- Specify (in advance) and follow logging conventions



Software Logging and Monitoring



Goal Group		Efficiency	Maintainability	Reliability	Security	Testability
Goal Examples		performance, energy saving, caching, im- proving resource con- sumption	bug finding, un- derstanding, reuse, documentation, troubleshooting	health checking, fault tolerance, disaster recovery, adaptation, configuration fix	anomaly detection, data protection, malicious attack detection	testing (generation, validation, selec- tion), reporting, verification
	Frequency	Number of occur- rences in a period	Number of references and dependencies	Inter-arrival times	Changes in occur- rence history	Number of occur- rences in test case
Criterion	Maintainability	Number of operations involved	Static source code metrics	-	Contextual infor- mation of objects/- classes	Fail test coverage
	Expensiveness	Execution time	Source code locations of expensive methods	CPU and heap uti- lization, processing times	Transaction duration	Depth of call stack
	Changeability	Number of repeated computations	Similarity between call graphs	Number of operations with cached results	Changes in contex- tual information	_
	Error-proneness	Number of failures of a component	Number of handled exceptions	Number of failures perceived by users	Increase of failures in a specific component	Number of failure as- sertions or exception- throwing statements
	Usage pattern	Changes in user navi- gational activity	-	Number of active users and idle/active intervals	Variations in the request payload for same operations	2 <u>-</u>
	State variation	I/O consumption per operation	Changes in the sys- tem state	Number of write op- erations performed	-	-
	Concurrency	Number of active users and threads	Number of references and dependencies	Number of race con- ditions	—	Number of locks per test case
	Latency	Processing and band- width consumption	-	Throughput	-	_





•Software Logging and Monitoring

• Tigris: a two-phase framework for software tracing





MERTZ, J. ; NUNES, I. . Tigris: a DSL and Framework for Monitoring Software Systems at Runtime. The Journal of Systems & Software, 2021.

•Summary



- Make an effective use of object orientation
- Have an architectural model
 - Software organisation and rules
- Adopt code review
- Manage technical debt
 - Make payments
- Use metrics and static analysis tools
- Collect runtime data
 - Consistent use of software logging
 - Know what data to collect with low performance impact



- Quality
 - Conformance with requirements
 - Organisational requirements
 - Project requirements
 - Functional
 - Non-functional













- Performance Bugs
 - Finding and fixing performance issues
 - Search for equal or similar objects
 - Overuse of temporary structures
 - Containers used too little or too much
 - Data unnecessarily copied
 - Etc.
 - A software engineer's responsibility!

Cloud computing: high costs The end of Moore's Law



Charles E. Leiserson. 2018. The Resurgence of Software Performance Engineering. SPAA '18. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1145/3210377.3210378



- Performance Bugs
 - Use of application-level caching

}

04/04/2021

```
public class C1() {
    public Object process() {
    //creating the cache component
    Cache cache = Cache.getInstance();
```

Podcast: Fronteiras em Engenharia de Software: <u>https://anchor.fm/fronteirases</u> Episode #8

```
//looking up for cache content (steps in b)
Object content = cache.get("cl:c2-computation");
if (content == null){
    //cache miss (steps in c)
    content = C2.compute();
    //caching the content for future requests
    cache.set("cl:c2-computation", content);
}
//doing some business logic...
return content;
}
```



MERTZ, J. ; NUNES, I. . Understanding Application-Level Caching in Web Applications: A Comprehensive Introduction and Survey of State-of-the-Art Approaches. ACM COMPUTING SURVEYS, v. 50, p. 1-34, 2017.

Ingrid Nunes <ingridnunes@inf.ufrgs.br>





DE INFORMÁTICA UFRGS

- Challenges



35

• Security Bugs

	ID: UC_0001					
	Nome: Fazer login					
	Descrição: Usuário solicita fazer login no sistema, fornecendo usuário e senha, que são validados. Caso sejam					
	válidos, usuário é logado no sistema. Caso contrário, o acesso é bloqueado. Mecanismos de segurança são					
	adotados para impedir o acesso de usuários maliciosos.					
	Pré-condições: nenhum usuário está logado no sistema.					
	Pós-condições: usuário está registrado como logado no sistema.					
	Fluxo Básico					
	1. Este caso inicia quando o usuário seleciona a opção para fazer login no sistema.					
	O sistema solicita ao usuário o seu nome de usuário e a senha.					
	O usuário fornece os dados solicitados.					
	O sistema valida as regras de negócio RN1, RN2, RN3 e RN6.					
	O sistema registra o usuário como usuário logado no sistema.					
	O sistema exibe a tela inicial do sistema.					
	7. O caso de uso termina.					
	Fluxos Alternativos					
	Fluxo Alternativo 1 – Alternativa ao passo 3					
	3a.1. O usuário seleciona a opção de lembrete de nome de usuário ou senha.					
	3a.2. O sistema solicita e-mail cadastrado no sistema.					
	3a.3. O usuário fornece e-mail.					
	3a.4. O sistema valida a regra de negócio RN5.					
	3a.5. O sistema envia e-mail com o nome do usuário e opção para redefinir a senha.					
	3a.6. Retorna ao passo 2.					
	Fluxo Alternativo 2 – Alternativa ao passo 3a.4.					
h I	3b.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN5 não foi satisfeita.					
	3b.2. O sistema emite o alerta "O e-mail fornecido não é um endereço de e-mail válido."					
UFRGS	3b.3. Retorna ao passo 3a.2.					

	Fluxo Alternativo 2 – Alternativa ao passo 3a.4.	
	3b.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN5 não foi satisfeita.	
	3b.2. O sistema emite o alerta "O e-mail fornecido não é um endereço de e-mail válido."	
	3b.3. Retorna ao passo 3a.2.	
	Fluxo Alternativo 3 – Alternativa ao passo 4	
	4a.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN1 não foi satisfeita.	
	4a.2. O sistema emite o alerta "Nome de usuário e senha são obrigatórios."	
	4a 3. Retorna ao passo 2	
	Fluxo Alternativo 4 – Alternativa ao passo 4	
	4b.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN2 não foi satisfeita.	
• 5	4b.2. O sistema emite o alerta "Nome de usuário ou senha incorretos."	
- 36	4b.3. Retorna ao passo 2.	
	Fluxo Alternativo 5 – Alternativa ao passo 4	
	4c.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN3 não foi satisfeita.	
	4c.2. O sistema contabiliza uma tentativa de login para o usuário com nome de usuário fornecido.	
	4c.3. O sistema valida a regra de negócio RN4.	
	4c.4. O sistema emite o alerta "Nome de usuário ou senha incorretos."	
	4c.5. Retorna ao passo 2.	
	Fluxo Alternativo 6 – Alternativa ao passo 4c.3.	
	4d.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN4 não foi satisfeita.	
	4d.2. O sistema bloqueia o usuário.	
	4d.3. O sistema emite o alerta "Usuário bloqueado: contate a nossa equipe de suporte."	
	4d.4. Retorna ao passo 2.	
	Fluxo Alternativo 7 – Alternativa ao passo 4.	
	4e.1. O sistema verifica que a regra de negócio RN6 não foi satisfeita.	
	4e.2. O sistema emite o alerta "Usuário bloqueado: contate a nossa equipe de suporte."	
	4e.3. Retorna ao passo 2.	
	Regras de Negócio	
	RN1. Um nome de usuário e uma senha foram fornecidos.	
	RN2. O nome de usuário fornecido corresponde a um nome de usuário cadastrado no sistema.	
	RN3. O hash da senha fornecida corresponde ao hash da senha cadastrada no sistema associada ao nome de	
	usuário fornecido.	
	RN4. Podem ser feitas no máximo 3 tentativas de login de um usuário com senha incorreta.	
	หพร. O string fornecido e composto por mais de um caractere e possui @ no meio do string, e termina com	
	".com".	
	RN6. O usuário não se encontra bloqueado.]
	Requisitos Não-funcionais	
٦F	Hashing da Senha: o algoritmo de hashing da senha deve ser SHA-3.	
	Tempo de resposta: o tempo de resposta de retorno quando as regras de negócio RN2 ou RN3 não forem válidas	36

INSTITUTO DE INFORMÁTICA UFRGS

36





04/04/2021

INSTITUTO DE INFORMÁTICA UFRGS From the ICSE presentation by @margaretstorey



Required for any path



https://github.com/kamranahmedse/developer-roadmap



04/04/2021

Ingrid Nunes <ingridnunes@inf.ufrgs.br>





- Heterogeneous world of technologies and programming languages
 - OO and functional languages
 - Compiled and interpreted languages
 - Strongly and dynamically typed languages
 - General purpose and domain-specific languages

Our central finding is that both static type systems find an important percentage of public bugs: both Flow 0.30 and TypeScript 2.0 successfully detect 15%!



Zheng Gao, Christian Bird, and Earl T. Barr. 2017. To type or not to type: quantifying detectable bugs in JavaScript. In Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '17). IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 758-769. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2017.75





Monoliths are fine if you are committed to them.

(Micro)services are fine if you are committed to them.

Microliths are what happens when an organization isn't brave enough to pick a lane. The worst of both worlds without the advantages of any of them.

7:49 PM · Mar 26, 2021 · TweetDeck

All project decisions must be well informed! Too bad that TECHNICAL decisions often become BUSINESS decisions.



a arquitetura do stack overflow é monolítica. é muito adequado a nossa história de escalabilidade. a gente não é e-commerce.



284 views

...

0:12/2:09 📢

•Final Considerations



- Most of the content of this talk are covered in undergraduate courses
 - Problem: theory vs. practice
 - Role of internship (at least, in Brazil)?

Programmers vs. Software Engineers

- To give importance to code maintainability and legibility
 - Cost reduction (less bugs, easier evolution)
 - Happy programmers







•Final Considerations



- Most of the content of this talk are covered in undergraduate courses
 - Problem: theory vs. practice
 - Role of internship (at least, in Brazil)?

Programmers vs. Software Engineers

- To give importance to code maintainability and legibility
 - Cost reduction (less bugs, easier evolution)
 - Happy programmers



Despite all advances, why does go horse still exist?





•Final Considerations



- How to help us?
 - Access to projects and developers for research
 - Project mining (with access to the source code or issue trackers)
 - Surveys with developers
 - It is possible to sign NDAs (Non-Disclosure Agreement)
 - Publicatins may or may not include acknowledgements
 - Annonymised data (after the company's approval)



•Thanks!

- Prof. Ingrid Nunes (UFRGS)
 - Homepage <u>http://inf.ufrgs.br/~ingridnunes/</u>
 - Twitter <u>https://twitter.com/ingridnunesIN</u>
 - Facebook <u>https://www.facebook.com/ingridnunesIN</u>
 - LinkedIn https://www.linkedin.com/in/ingrid-nunes/

Why does go horse still exist?







