



# From Development to Deployment

Case Study

| oyster

BuildMonkey Team  
<http://www.buildmonkey.com>

## **Table of Contents**

Table of Contents.....	2
Summary .....	3
The Project .....	4
The Problem .....	5
Agile Development Feeding Non-Agile Production.....	5
Fixed Price, Fixed Deadline .....	5
Ownership of Target Platform.....	5
Assumptions Cost Time and Money .....	5
Bad Deployment? It Must Be Bad Software .....	6
The Solution.....	7
Agile Development Feeding Non-Agile Production.....	7
Fixed Price, Fixed Deadline .....	7
Ownership of Target Platform.....	7
Assumptions Cost Time and Money .....	7
Bad Deployment? It Must Be Bad Software .....	8
The Result .....	9
About BuildMonkey .....	10

## **Summary**

Oyster Partners were engaged by a large global bank to develop a modern replacement for the bank intranet. This had to be handed over to a third-party global outsourcer – who manage the production environment.

This case study demonstrates how Oyster were able to significantly reduce the cost, and increase the certainty, of this handover through the use of Deployment Verification from BuildMonkey.

## **The Project**

The bank embarked on a modernisation of their ageing intranet service, and engaged Oyster Partners – arguably the market leader in web experience management – to design and implement the new system.

The timescales for the project were aggressive, and the delivery date had been publicly committed to within the bank – the cost of failure, purely in terms of reputation, was significant.

In line with its best practices, Oyster chose to implement the solution on top of a Tomcat/Apache/Oracle platform, using the Java programming language. Interwoven Teamsite was used as the content management platform since this is what is used within the bank.

## The Problem

### ***Agile Development Feeding Non-Agile Production***

Oyster Partners employ Agile methodologies for their development to maintain high levels of quality and productivity. The bank, a large global financial institution, have stable and well-defined infrastructure and processes.

This can clearly be a problem – where development output is faster, and more agile, than production infrastructure can accommodate.

### ***Fixed Price, Fixed Deadline***

The problem with fixed price, fixed deadline is, quite simply, that any delay or rework eats straight into the net profit for the work being performed.

Oyster were keen to ensure that their reputation for quality and timely delivery was maintained, as well as their profit margin.

### ***Ownership of Target Platform***

The target platform, which consisted of 12 different servers, was not built and installed by Oyster, and its contents and makeup were unknown, although Oyster had specified certain pre-requisites in terms of service pack levels, or application versions and locations.

Oyster were very keen to identify any differences in the platform from these pre-requisite specifications, to avoid adverse perception on the quality of their software, and to do so in a way that would not affect the very tight project timeline.

The suitability of the target platform is always a potential problem when handing over to a third-party hosting organisation, especially where multiple teams may have been involved in the construction of the platform (e.g. DBAs, networks, security etc) or where corporate I.T. policies may have an impact on the platform design.

### ***Assumptions Cost Time and Money***

Certain assumptions are always made about the target platforms – the name of the “*Administrator*” account, drive and path names and so on. This is normal, since there are certain *de facto* standards that are in common use.

But what if those assumptions turn out to be false? What if the software expects that all of its data files reside on the **D:** drive, but there is no such drive on the target host? Is this an application design issue? A deployment issue? Who accepts the responsibility?

*BuildMonkey. Because deployment is a thief.*

Oyster were keen to avoid any such assumptions impacting their ability to deliver quality software, on-time and to specification.

***Bad Deployment? It Must Be Bad Software***

When difficulties are encountered deploying the application, or if the installation takes longer than it should due to platform integration problems (or assumptions) then the perception is that the software must be of poor quality, or that it will be costly and difficult to manage going forward.

Oyster wanted to ensure that the ease of the deployment was a fair reflection on the quality of their development, and did not create any negative perceptions.

## **The Solution**

### ***Agile Development Feeding Non-Agile Production***

Goal: Oyster were keen to ensure that production infrastructure could react quickly enough to keep pace with development output, in a risk-free way.

By using the Deployment Verification System from BuildMonkey, Oyster were able to verify the fitness of target environments long before any code was delivered, so that any issues that may arise in deployment were identified very early in the development cycle.

This ensured any the relevant changes (be they environmental or application) could be analysed and approved well before delivery – in parallel with development.

### ***Fixed Price, Fixed Deadline***

Goal: Oyster were keen to ensure that their reputation for quality and timely delivery was maintained, as well as their profit margin.

By engaging specialists to undertake the packaging and deployment phases of the project, Oyster successfully de-risked these activities and was able to focus on the development of a robust and feature-rich application.

### ***Ownership of Target Platform***

Goal: Oyster were very keen to identify any differences in the platform from these pre-requisite specifications, to avoid adverse perception on the quality of their software, and to do so in a way that would not affect the very tight project timeline.

By using the buildMonkey Deployment Verification System (DVS), Oyster were able to determine – instantly – whether the target environment was built to the exact specifications required.

The third-party hosting organisation were provided with a regression capability that allowed them to verify – instantly – that the infrastructure conformed to application requirements.

Both of these activities were taken off the critical path and were conducted in parallel with development activities – saving time and money, and contributing to a successful delivery.

### ***Assumptions Cost Time and Money***

Goal: Oyster were keen to avoid any such assumptions impacting their ability to deliver quality software, on-time and to specification.

*BuildMonkey. Because deployment is a thief.*

By providing platform specifications, and the automated tests to report on whether or not they were met, Oyster were able to avoid making any assumptions about the target environment.

The preparation of these platform specifications, and tests, did not impact the project timeline in any way, and helped ensure its success.

### ***Bad Deployment? It Must Be Bad Software***

Goal: Oyster wanted to ensure that the ease of the deployment was a fair reflection on the quality of their development, and did not create any negative perceptions.

By engaging buildMonkey to prepare the packaging and deployment, an automated deployment was created, along with full documentation to enable the third party hosting organisation to manage future deployments.

This not only made deployment a risk-free activity, it also provided handover and sign-off, as well as an excellent reflection on Oyster's ability to deliver quality applications for large-scale customers.

*BuildMonkey. Because deployment is a thief.*

## **The Result**

By using BuildMonkey software and services, Oyster Partners were able to enhance their deserved reputation for quality software with a reputation for on-time delivery and hassle-free deployment.

Instead of hemorrhaging money at the deployment phase, the milestone was reached without a hitch.

The project was successfully delivered, on-time, to Oyster's delighted customers.

*BuildMonkey. Because deployment is a thief.*

## **About BuildMonkey**

BuildMonkey are the market leaders in Build, SCM and Deployment.

Formed in 1999, and with many Fortune 500 and FTSE 100 blue-chip clients, we are the original and the best.

All of the concepts described in this paper have been encapsulated in a suite of off-the-shelf tools and associated processes to facilitate rapid implementation of the Best Practices set out in this paper.

We are passionate about solving the problems which plague software development. We know that, with very little effort, it is possible for software to be delivered on-time, on-budget and free of defects.