Module Guide for Chess Connect

Team #4,
Alexander Van Kralingen
Arshdeep Aujla
Jonathan Cels
Joshua Chapman
Rupinder Nagra

January 18, 2023

1 Revision History

Table of Revisions

Table 1: Revision History

Date	Developer(s)	Change
2023-01-16	Jonathan Cels, Rupinder Nagra	Web Application Modules
2023-01-18	Jonathan Cels, Rupinder Nagra	Finalized Web Application Modules

2 Reference Material

This section records information for easy reference.

2.1 Abbreviations and Acronyms

symbol	description
AC	Anticipated Change
DAG	Directed Acyclic Graph
M	Module
MG	Module Guide
OS	Operating System
R	Requirement
SC	Scientific Computing
SRS	Software Requirements Specification
UC	Unlikely Change
FEN	Forsyth-Edwards Notation

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

3 Introduction

Decomposing a system into modules is a commonly accepted approach to developing software. A module is a work assignment for a programmer or programming team (Parnas et al., 1984). We advocate a decomposition based on the principle of information hiding (Parnas, 1972). This principle supports design for change, because the "secrets" that each module hides represent likely future changes. Design for change is valuable in SC, where modifications are frequent, especially during initial development as the solution space is explored.

Our design follows the rules layed out by Parnas et al. (1984), as follows:

- System details that are likely to change independently should be the secrets of separate modules.
- Each data structure is implemented in only one module.
- Any other program that requires information stored in a module's data structures must obtain it by calling access programs belonging to that module.

After completing the first stage of the design, the Software Requirements Specification (SRS), the Module Guide (MG) is developed (Parnas et al., 1984). The MG specifies the modular structure of the system and is intended to allow both designers and maintainers to easily identify the parts of the software. The potential readers of this document are as follows:

- New project members: This document can be a guide for a new project member to easily understand the overall structure and quickly find the relevant modules they are searching for.
- Maintainers: The hierarchical structure of the module guide improves the maintainers' understanding when they need to make changes to the system. It is important for a maintainer to update the relevant sections of the document after changes have been made.
- Designers: Once the module guide has been written, it can be used to check for consistency, feasibility and flexibility. Designers can verify the system in various ways, such as consistency among modules, feasibility of the decomposition, and flexibility of the design.

The rest of the document is organized as follows. Section 4 lists the anticipated and unlikely changes of the software requirements. Section 5 summarizes the module decomposition that was constructed according to the likely changes. Section 6 specifies the connections between the software requirements and the modules. Section 7 gives a detailed description of the modules. Section 8 includes two traceability matrices. One checks the completeness of the design against the requirements provided in the SRS. The other shows the relation between anticipated changes and the modules. Section 9 describes the use relation between modules.

4 Anticipated and Unlikely Changes

This section lists possible changes to the system. According to the likeliness of the change, the possible changes are classified into two categories. Anticipated changes are listed in Section 4.1, and unlikely changes are listed in Section 4.2.

4.1 Anticipated Changes

Anticipated changes are the source of the information that is to be hidden inside the modules. Ideally, changing one of the anticipated changes will only require changing the one module that hides the associated decision. The approach adapted here is called design for change.

AC1: The specific hardware on which the software is running.

AC2: The format of the initial input data.

...

4.2 Unlikely Changes

The module design should be as general as possible. However, a general system is more complex. Sometimes this complexity is not necessary. Fixing some design decisions at the system architecture stage can simplify the software design. If these decision should later need to be changed, then many parts of the design will potentially need to be modified. Hence, it is not intended that these decisions will be changed.

UC1: Input/Output devices (Input: File and/or Keyboard, Output: File, Memory, and/or Screen).

...

5 Module Hierarchy

This section provides an overview of the module design. Modules are summarized in a hierarchy decomposed by secrets in Table 2. The modules listed below, which are leaves in the hierarchy tree, are the modules that will actually be implemented.

M1: Hardware-Hiding Module

M2: Web Application Input Module

M3: Display Module

M4: Web Application Output Module

M5: User Mode Module

M6: Board Module

M7: Web Application Game State Module

M8: Engine Module

Level 1	**Level 2**
Hardware-Hiding Module	
Behaviour-Hiding Module	Web Application Input Module
	Display Module
	Web Application Output Module
	?
	?
	?
	?
Software Decision Module	User Mode Module
	Board Module
	Web Application Game State Module
	Engine Module
	?
	?
	?

Table 2: Module Hierarchy

6 Connection Between Requirements and Design

The design of the system is intended to satisfy the requirements developed in the SRS. In this stage, the system is decomposed into modules. The connection between requirements and modules is listed in Table 3.

[The intention of this section is to document decisions that are made "between" the requirements and the design. To satisfy some requirements, design decisions need to be made. Rather than make these decisions implicit, they are explicitly recorded here. For instance, if a program has security requirements, a specific design decision may be made to satisfy those requirements with a password. In scientific examples, the choice of algorithm could potentially go here, if that is a decision that is exposed by the interface. —SS]

7 Module Decomposition

Modules are decomposed according to the principle of "information hiding" proposed by Parnas et al. (1984). The *Secrets* field in a module decomposition is a brief statement of the design decision hidden by the module. The *Services* field specifies *what* the module will do without documenting *how* to do it. For each module, a suggestion for the implementing software is given under the *Implemented By* title. If the entry is *OS*, this means that the module is provided by the operating system or by standard programming language libraries. *Chess Connect* means the module will be implemented by the Chess Connect software.

Only the leaf modules in the hierarchy have to be implemented. If a dash (–) is shown, this means that the module is not a leaf and will not have to be implemented.

7.1 Hardware Hiding Modules (M1)

Secrets: The data structure and algorithm used to implement the virtual hardware.

Services: Serves as a virtual hardware used by the rest of the system. This module provides the interface between the hardware and the software. So, the system can use it to display outputs or to accept inputs.

Implemented By: OS

7.2 Behaviour-Hiding Modules

7.2.1 Web Application Input Module (M2)

Secrets: Input data.

Services: Takes in input data of current board state to provide to other modules.

Implemented By: Chess Connect (Node.js libraries, Bluetooth)

7.2.2 Display Module M3

Secrets: Graphics output data.

Services: Allows users to view the current board configuration of the system.

Implemented By: Chess Connect (React.js framework)

7.2.3 Web Application Output Module M4

Secrets: None.

Services: Takes game state and engine moves, encodes the data, and transmits it.

Implemented By: Chess Connect (React.js framework, Bluetooth)

7.3 Software Decision Module

7.3.1 User Mode Module M5

Secrets: User mode logic and data.

Services: Handles switching between user modes and communicating with mode-specific modules.

Implemented By: Chess Connect (React.js framework)

7.3.2 Board Module M6

Secrets: Board data.

Services: Stores and modifies board state information.

Implemented By: Chess Connect (React.js framework)

7.3.3 Web Application Game State Module M7

Secrets: Game state and data.

Services: Handles checking the game state (none, check, checkmate, stalemate).

Implemented By: Chess Connect (React.js framework, Node.js libraries)

7.3.4 Engine Module M8

Secrets: Chess engine moves.

Services: Uses the board state to calculate 3 possible moves.

Implemented By: Chess Connect (Node.js libraries and Stockfish)

8 Traceability Matrix

This section shows two traceability matrices: between the modules and the requirements and between the modules and the anticipated changes.

Req.	Modules
R1	M1, M2, M??, M??
R2	M2, M??
R3	M??
R4	M4, M??
R5	M4, M??, M??, M??, M??, M??
R6	M4, M??, M??, M??, M??, M??
R7	M4, M??, M??, M??, M??
R8	M4, M??, M??, M??, M??
R9	M??
R10	M4, M??, M??
R11	M4, M??, M??, M??

Table 3: Trace Between Requirements and Modules

AC	Modules
AC1	M1
AC2	M2
AC??	M??
AC??	M??
AC??	M4
AC??	M??
AC??	M??
AC??	M??
AC??	M??
AC??	M??
AC??	M??
AC??	M??

Table 4: Trace Between Anticipated Changes and Modules

9 Use Hierarchy Between Modules

In this section, the uses hierarchy between modules is provided. Parnas (1978) said of two programs A and B that A *uses* B if correct execution of B may be necessary for A to complete

the task described in its specification. That is, A *uses* B if there exist situations in which the correct functioning of A depends upon the availability of a correct implementation of B. Figure 1 illustrates the use relation between the modules. It can be seen that the graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Each level of the hierarchy offers a testable and usable subset of the system, and modules in the higher level of the hierarchy are essentially simpler because they use modules from the lower levels.

Figure 1: Use hierarchy among modules

References

David L. Parnas. On the criteria to be used in decomposing systems into modules. *Comm. ACM*, 15(2):1053–1058, December 1972.

David L. Parnas. Designing software for ease of extension and contraction. In *ICSE '78: Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Software engineering*, pages 264–277, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 1978. IEEE Press. ISBN none.

D.L. Parnas, P.C. Clement, and D. M. Weiss. The modular structure of complex systems. In *International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 408–419, 1984.