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# Resolution

While he considers interface design as a distinct activity in his design process, Dennis Buede concedes that the activity does not occur in a vacuum nor is it without consequences in both functional and physical architecting. In our reading he acknowledges this, “The development of the interface architecture is quite similar to the development of the operational architecture of a system…”[[1]](#footnote-1) His use of the word, “analogous,” is powerful: “This high-level architecture for the interface is analogous to the concept selection for the system design.”[[2]](#footnote-2) The tight coupling between the activities and identification of causality in the relationship is further developed, “As interface changes arrive from the process responsible for the system’s operational architecture, the relevant functions for developing the interface architecture are triggered and set the whole process in motion to develop a revised interface architecture.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

Buede’s and Grady’s positions are really not so far apart and may be better characterized by a distinction on principle. Unless you are using a software tool that allows the simultaneous creation of interface definition and architecture, you are likely to be moving between these tasks as you iterate your understanding of your problem space, environment, etc. To whose world view you ascribe this process may say more about how you see your approach than it does to how you carry out your activities.
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