

Re: XP Requirement Analysis?

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.object/2004-09/1521.html>

From: Universe (*universe_at_tAkEcovad.OuT.net*)

Date: 09/29/04

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 2004 16:30:15 -0400

Laurent Bossavit <laurent@dontspambossavit.com> wrote:

> *Elliott,*

>

>> *Rationalism: a view that reason and experience rather than the
>> non-rational are the fundamental criteria in the solution of problems.*

>> *Webster On-line*

> *Sounds circular and question-begging. What you'd expect from a
> dictionary?*

Curious, what do you find circular.

And I did give my here following it because I wasn't 100% with it.

However I gave "the man's" version ;- } because it presents the concept as viewed by many other than myself – and for that reason if no other is tends to be useful to present.

>> *And as I see "rationalism" it's more so as I state in another post
>> today: the ability of proven knowledge – that is *theory* – to
>> rationally inform and *lead* our work practice.*

I differ from Webster's in stressing that reason, theory, reasoning conceptualization should play the "leading" role, in our activities while practice should verify.

Directly opposed to that, philosophical pragmatism and empiricism that underlie XP places greater emphasis on the results of recent, or immediate practice. It favors the aphorism, "if it works do it".

Whereas I emphasize the value of studying prior, historical, or already summarized experience in what we are doing and applying lessons learned creatively according to specific context. This is the 1st part of what I mean by "theory leads".

The 2nd part of what "theory leads" is that our current activity should be mapped out in always amenable theory, ideas as a plan. "Amenable"

comp.object: Re: XP Requirement Analysis?

plans means that they may modified, or replaced in toto during the course of project IID – iterative and incremental development.

Amenable plans should largely be constructed based upon:

- ` ideas, theory, thinking, concepts, reasoning from prior activity in contextually similar and relevant circumstances
- ` ideas, theory, thinking, concepts, reasoning resulting from investigation, and discovery of the current project context, and goals.

Plans may be modified based upon system user, management, domain expert, or developer feedback from activities during the course of the project.

Projects should have:

- ` a panoply of mechanisms for eliciting and incorporating feedback during its IID
- ` multiple times of regularly scheduled feedback sessions between system users, management, domain experts, and or developers.

A 3rd related facet of this is that the project should evaluate, weigh, tradeoff and otherwise make decisions with a holistic, systems perspective. They should be made always after understanding and considering together as whole, all key relevant parts of the whole project. What is part and what is whole differs each kind of project decision. But both the particular whole and parts involved should identified and handled in the foregoing manner for all major project decisions.

Of course this means employing a use case leading, model drive architecture approach as with UP and MDA at OMG. [See www.omg.com for details.]

High level system design should explicitly be based upon or embed an object model of real actual domain entities and processes that a play and role insofar as they are relevant to project use cases as whole – project scope. There are a number of reasons this help create the most optimal OO designs, and I will detail in soon to follow posts over the next 2–3 days.

Finally for completion the project should apply relevant contextually objective facts and a scientific: hypothesis, experiment, theory back to practice and so on approach.

These are significant kind of rational holistic practices and viewpoints that a truly "scientifico–engineering" approach to software development takes.

That is as opposed to the:

- ` piecemeal
- ` frequent stovepipe design cul–de–sac waste of resources turnaround
- ` part above whole designs and decisions
- ` coder–centric

comp.object: Re: XP Requirement Analysis?

nature of XP project development.

Again, for those whom haven't *actually* read up on the essentials of UP and MDA to best contribute to improving OO and software engineering, which should be the intent, the goal of discussion on these matters. It is at least as far as I am concerned. That of certainly means striving to be and remain intellectually honest as well.

Elliott

--

How can Bush be winning on terrorism when:

- ~ the war in Iraq diverts military and \$\$\$
from Al Queda et al?

- ~ Iraq is NOW a tremendous hot bed of terrorism?

How can Bush be an expert at foreign affairs when:

- ~ he's bungling the war in Iraq as just judged BY
INTELLIGENCE EXPERTS?

- ~ he's alienated and worsened world US support?