

BRUCE F. WEBSTER

Political pitfalls

- Not educating and enlisting management before the fact
- Underestimating the resistance
- Overselling the technology or methodology
- Not recognizing the politics of architecture
- Getting religious about the technology or methodology
- Getting on the feature release treadmill
- Betting the company on a given technology or methodology
- Picking the wrong horse

Not educating and enlisting management before the fact

- Issue: adopting a new technology or management (TOM) w/out notifying management of the potential issues ahead of time can backfire
- Symptoms: failure to meeting management expectations about the TOM
- Consequences: lack of support/backing from management if things go south
- Detection: sit down with management and find out what they think the TOM will do
- Extraction: better late then never -- make sure management has a realistic understanding and expectation for the TOM
- Prevention: first, make sure your own expectations are realistic; second, make sure management has its own expectations appropriately set

Underestimating the resistance

- Issue: not everyone is going to want your team/project/firm to adopt the new TOM; remember, people hate change
- Symptoms: lack of support at different levels; people distancing themselves from your decisions
- Consequences: project slows down or even fails, with corresponding consequences
- Detection: can be hard; start one-on-one talks to try to find what key people think
- **Extraction**: push ahead; mollify; redirect; or abandon
- Prevention: sound out key people ahead of time and make sure your support is solid

Overselling the technology or methodology

- Issue: enthusiasm can lead you to focus only on the anticipated benefits of adopting the TOM and none of the potential or real pitfalls
- Symptoms: you have to keep making excuses and/or people start asking pointed questions
- Consequences: loss of trust from those who believed you; backstabbing from those who didn't.
- Detection: list the promised benefits of the TOM and then give a realistic appraisal of the likelihood of achieving them
- Extraction: start readjusting expectations immediately; "take no small slips"
- Prevention: "underpromise and overdeliver"

Not recognizing the politics of architecture

- Issue: as an architect, you occupy a role of political leadership and need to enlist the support and enthusiasm of team members (and management) for your proposed architecture
- Symptoms: assuming that everyone will just go along with what you say. Finger-pointing at you when roadblocks appear.
- Consequences: hidden or overt team dissention, poor morale, lack of cooperation
- Detection: how much support do you have? What are the obstacles you're facing?
- Extraction: hard, because you have to sooth feeling and enroll team members after problems have arisen.
- Prevention: enroll support and feedback up front

Getting religious about the technology or methodology-

- Issue: getting overly optimistic/enthusiastic about the TOM
- Symptoms: an almost blind faith in the virtues of the TO M and a blindness to its pitfalls and failings
- Consequences: heated arguments and an inability to be objective
- Detection: ask those skeptical of the TOM about their reasons
- Extraction: dial back your (or others') enthusiasm; be open to skepticism; leave yourself an escape route
- Prevention: thoroughly research criticism of the TOM ahead of time and bake that into whatever presentations you make

Getting on the feature release treadmill

- Issue: success in a version release often brings a new slew of feature requests instead of a chance to retire any technical debt and/or fix known defects
- Symptoms: constantly having to push tech debt/bug fixes into a future release and not the current one
- Consequences: the cost of adding features goes up, and the product becomes less stable
- Detection: detail tech debt/deferred bugs to management and see response
- **Extraction**: may be hard; have to fight to fix what's important
- Prevention: from the very start, emphasize the need to reduce technical debt and open defects, and why their have priority over new features

Betting the company on a given technology or methodology

- Issue: While there are no silver bullets, we sometimes act as if there are, particularly with some shiny new technology or methodology.
- Symptoms: unrealistic expectations on the part of upper management, marketing, developers.
- Consequences: major schedule adjustment or even project/market failure.
- Detection: does the current business plan make sense absent the TOM?
- Extraction: list the factors required for success independent of the TOM – is the project still feasible?
- Prevention: bet your company on your people, not a particular TOM.

Picking the wrong horse

- **Issue:** sometimes we bet on a platform, environment, or TOM that doesn't p_{α}^{∞} out (NeXTstep, Windows Phone, etc.), due to overly optimistic expectation
- Symptoms: outside sources continue to raise issues and problems with your target platform/environment/TOM. Development resources hard to find.
- Consequences: your project struggles to get developers and potential customers. Even if the system ships, it may lack market size or ongoing support.
- **Detection**: talk frequently with other firms adopting the same TOM. Fact-check claims about potential market share and benefits. 5:30 PM
- **Extraction**: migrate to a different platform or TOM.
- Prevention: this is hard, given the risk/reward of being the first to take advantage of a successful platform or TOM.

er 2023 Ster