In this chapter

I will show how to use Commonality and Variability Analysis (CVA) to develop a high-level application design. Although design patterns can't be used in all designs, the lessons learned from them can. One of the most important of these lessons is that you can identify variation in your system using CVA. You can then follow the lessons of design patterns (program to interfaces, encapsulate variation using aggregation) to create designs that are flexible and easily testable.

Note from Alan Shalloway:

When Design Patterns Explained first came out I felt we were on the edge of something with Commonality – Variability Analysis. Unfortunately, we had to get the book out. This was always an incompletion for me. Our second edition has a great chapter on CVA and here it is!
Commonality and Variability Analysis and Application Design

Isolating Variation is a Design Pattern Philosophy

Experienced developers know that when adding new function to an existing system, the major cost is often not in writing the new code, but in integrating it into the existing system. The reason for this is that the pieces in most existing systems are fairly tightly coupled. We must eliminate, or greatly limit, this coupling. One reason this occurs is that developers often consider how entities relate to each other before they are clear what the right entities are. From my experience of training people at all different levels of competency, I have come to the conclusion that more experienced developers do this even more than inexperienced developers. Developers need a way first to identify what they have before trying to find the relationships involved.

I suggest that you design applications in the following way: First, use CVA to identify the concepts (commonalities) and concrete implementations (variabilities) that are present in the problem domain. At this point we are mostly interested in identifying the concepts here, but many variabilities will be identified as part of this process. Any entities in the problem domain that are not included in these concepts (e.g., there may be some one-of-a-kind objects present) should also be identified. Next, once the concept for the functionality you need has been identified, you go on to specify the interface for the abstraction that encapsulates this. Derive this interface by considering how the concrete implementations derived from this abstraction will be used.

This approach basically follows Alexander's contextual design approach which is incorporated into the previously mentioned "Dependency Inversion Principle". By defining these interfaces, you are also determining which object use which objects – completing the specification of the design.

Let's see this in action with the CAD/CAM problem.

Solving the CAD/CAM Problem with CVA

Finding the concepts (and therefore abstract classes)

When analyzing the problem domain with CVA, I want to see what concepts are there and then try to organize these pieces as cohesively as possible. Remembering the CAD/CAM system, there are:

- different CAD/CAM systems – V1, V2. In this situation, these are essentially read-only, proprietary databases that will provide the numerical control sets the expert system needs to do its work.
- different kinds of Features – slots, holes, cutouts, special and irregular.
- different kinds of Models – V1-based and V2-based.
To say there are different CAD/CAM systems really means that the concept is "CAD/CAM system" and the variations of it are "V1" and "V2". CVA leads to the following commonalities and their corresponding variations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>commonality: CAD/CAM system variations:</th>
<th>commonality: features variations:</th>
<th>commonality: model variations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>slot</td>
<td>V1-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>hole</td>
<td>V2-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cutout</td>
<td>special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An alternative approach is to pick any two items in the problem domain and ask the following questions:

1. Is one of these a variation of the other?

2. Are both of these a variation of something else?

For example, I might notice that there are features and slots. A slot is a kind of feature. I guess that "features" is a commonality and "slots" is a variation of it. Or, I might see that there are slots and holes. Within this problem domain, they do not seem to be variations of each other. They both seem to be variations of "features". Or I might compare the V1 CAD/CAM system and slots. There does not seem to be anything in common with them.

One issue per commonality

Of course, it is not always this simple. I may collapse concepts without realizing it. For example, suppose you think about the problem domain as having V1Slots, V1Holes, V2Slots, V2Holes, etc. The commonality would seem to be "CAD/CAM features". But this is commonality with two concepts: "CAD/CAM version" and "features". CVA
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says that commonalities should really be based on one issue per commonality. Otherwise I will not have strong cohesion in my design. Recognizing that I have two commonalities - CAD/CAM and Features – should lead me to ask which variations of these commonalities do I have? When I do this I come up with the variations I listed in Figure 15-1. This is one of the values of CVA: it results in cohesive concepts.

Representing the concepts
Figure 15-2 is a reproduction of Figure 6-5.

![Figure 15-2](attachment:figure15_2.png)

The relationship between commonality and variability analysis, perspectives, and abstract classes.

The information in Figure 15-1 can be translated into three different class hierarchies by following the guidelines laid out in Figure 15-2. These are shown in Figure 15-3.

![Figure 15-3](attachment:figure15_3.png)

Translating CVA table into classes.
Relating the concepts

The next step involves determining how the concepts relate to each other. Models contain **Features** and **Features** are extracted from the CAD/CAM system. When I was designing this system, I thought it would be simpler if I built stand-alone **Features** that contained all of the information that had been in the CAD/CAM system that related to them. In other words, the CAD/CAM system was like a database to the Features – it contained the information about the **Features**. The **Features** presented the appropriate methods to make this information available, but the **Features** extracted this info from the CAD/CAM to get it. Models would also have to relate to the CAD/CAM system. Based on this analysis, the next level of detail is shown in Figure 15-4.

![Figure 15-4 Our class diagram showing relationships between the classes.](image)

I am faced with a design decision here. Do I want to have different types of models or have one type of model that uses the different CAD/CAM systems through the **CADCAM** interface? In other words, if I move the methods in **V1Model** and **V2Model** that are peculiar to the CAD/CAM system into the **CADCAM** class hierarchy, I can probably avoid having different types of **Models**. This approach seems superior because Models use the CAD/CAM systems to implement them, but the concepts in **Model** are not inherently part of the CAD/CAM system. I show this approach in Figure 15-5. Don’t get hung up on this distinction: there is not a great difference in code quality between the two of them as long as you make sure you do not have any redundancy. Personally, I like the solution shown in Figure 15-5 better because it has classes that are more cohesive. Therefore, I will use that for the rest of the design.
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Expanding the design

I still need to expand the design to relate the CADCAM classes to the actual V1 and V2 implementations. Recalling what we know about the Facade and Adapter patterns, it should be clear that \texttt{V1CADCAM} should simply be a facade to the V1 system while \texttt{V2CADCAM} should wrap (adapt) the V2 system (\texttt{OOG\_Part}). I show this in Figure 15-6.

Contrast this with the solution arrived at using design patterns directly. This is shown in Figure 15-7.
The two look surprisingly similar. Or, maybe not. The solution arrived at using design patterns was derived by using patterns in a contextual way. I applied one pattern at a time until the solution unfolded. This is very similar to the CVA approach:

1. Identify commonalities first.
2. Create abstractions from these.
3. Identify derivations with the variations of the commonalities.
4. See how the commonalities relate to each other.

This is another type of design by context. The interfaces of the classes are defined within the context of how they are used by other abstractions. The class definitions are similar in both approaches because CVA is just another way of finding what varies and encapsulating it in cohesive, loosely coupled classes – principles upon which the design patterns are based. The same principles and approaches therefore lead to remarkably similar solutions.

In truth, the two approaches are highly synergistic. CVA says to focus on abstractions early, which increases the probability that I will find the most useful ones. Design patterns focus on the relationships between those abstractions, but do not help identify those abstractions in the first place.

On the other hand design patterns allow me to apply specific insights from past successful designs, whereas CVA does not. For example, I know it is often desirable to keep Facades
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stateless due to the fact that they tend to be large, and so creating multiple instances can affect performance. Pulling the state needed by the features out of the Facade and placing it in the Adapter allows me to implement the Facade as a Singleton. CVA would not lead me to that conclusion.

Summary

In this chapter
I explained how CVA can be used to create high-level application designs. By defining our commonalities first, we eliminate coupling between our special cases. Because design patterns are really about isolating variations and commonality and variability analysis, used the way I described, does the same thing, we can get similar solutions with CVA that we get using design patterns. The advantage of the CVA approach, however, is that it can be used all the time. We can only design with patterns when we know the patterns involved. Something that my experience shows doesn't happen that often.

Review Questions

Observations
1. What are two approaches to identifying commonalities and variabilities?

Interpretations
1. CVA says you should have only one issue per commonality. Why is this important?

Opinions and Applications
1. “Experienced developers - even more than inexperienced ones - often focus on entity relationships too early, before they are clear what the right entities are”. Is that your experience? Give an example to confirm or refute this statement.

2. Relate the approach to design starting with CVA with Alexander's approach.

“To join a discussion about this article, please go to http://www.netobjectivesgroups.com/6/ubb.x and look under the E-zines category.

“I cannot believe that the purpose of life is to be “happy.” I think the purpose of life is to be useful, to be responsible, to be honorable, to be compassionate. It is, above all, to matter: to count, to stand for something, to have made some difference that you lived at all.

— Leo Rosten

But being happy while you do all these is a good thing.

— Alan Shalloway
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