



# Machine Learning in Production Process and Technical Debt

# Process...

## Fundamentals of Engineering AI-Enabled Systems

**Holistic system view:** AI and non-AI components, pipelines, stakeholders, environment interactions, feedback loops

### Requirements:

System and model goals  
User requirements  
Environment assumptions  
Quality beyond accuracy  
Measurement  
Risk analysis  
Planning for mistakes

### Architecture + design:

Modeling tradeoffs  
Deployment architecture  
Data science pipelines  
Telemetry, monitoring  
Anticipating evolution  
Big data processing  
Human-AI design

### Quality assurance:

Model testing  
Data quality  
QA automation  
Testing in production  
Infrastructure quality  
Debugging

### Operations:

Continuous deployment  
Contin. experimentation  
Configuration mgmt.  
Monitoring  
Versioning  
Big data  
DevOps, MLOps

**Teams and process:** Data science vs software eng. workflows, interdisciplinary teams, collaboration points, technical debt

## Responsible AI Engineering

Provenance,  
versioning,  
reproducibility

Safety

Security and  
privacy

Fairness

Interpretability  
and explainability

Transparency  
and trust

Ethics, governance, regulation, compliance, organizational culture

# Readings

## Required Reading:

- Sculley, David, Gary Holt, Daniel Golovin, Eugene Davydov, Todd Phillips, Dietmar Ebner, Vinay Chaudhary, Michael Young, Jean-Francois Crespo, and Dan Dennison. "[Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems](#)." In Advances in neural information processing systems, pp. 2503-2511. 2015.


## Suggested Readings:

- Fowler and Highsmith. [The Agile Manifesto](#)
- Steve McConnell. Software project survival guide. Chapter 3
- Kruchten, Philippe, Robert L. Nord, and Ipek Ozkaya. "[Technical debt: From metaphor to theory and practice](#)." IEEE Software 29, no. 6 (2012): 18-21.

# Learning Goals

- Overview of common data science workflows (e.g., CRISP-DM)
  - Importance of iteration and experimentation
  - Role of computational notebooks in supporting data science workflows
- Overview of software engineering processes and lifecycles: costs and benefits of process, common process models, role of iteration and experimentation
- Contrasting data science and software engineering processes, goals and conflicts
- Integrating data science and software engineering workflows in process model for engineering AI-enabled systems with ML and non-ML components; contrasting different kinds of AI-enabled systems with data science trajectories
- Overview of technical debt as metaphor for process management; common sources of technical debt in AI-enabled systems

# Case Study: Real-Estate Website

The screenshot shows the Zillow website homepage. At the top, there is a navigation bar with links for "Buy", "Rent", "Sell", "Home Loans", and "Agent finder". To the right of these links is the Zillow logo, which consists of a stylized blue 'Z' icon followed by the word "Zillow" in a bold, blue, sans-serif font. To the right of the logo are links for "Manage Rentals", "Advertise", "Help", and "Sign in". Below the navigation bar is a large, dark blue photograph of a house's exterior, showing the roofline and windows. Overlaid on this image is the text "Reimagine home" in a large, white, serif font, and below it, "We'll help you find a place you'll love." in a smaller, white, sans-serif font. At the bottom of the page is a white search bar containing the placeholder text "Enter an address, neighborhood, city, or ZIP c..." followed by a blue magnifying glass icon. In the bottom left corner of the main content area, there is a small blue three-line menu icon. The overall layout is clean and modern, designed to guide users towards finding their next home.

Buy Rent Sell Home Loans Agent finder

 Zillow<sup>®</sup>

Manage Rentals Advertise Help Sign in

Reimagine home

We'll help you find a place you'll love.

Enter an address, neighborhood, city, or ZIP c... 



# ML Component: Predicting Real Estate Value

Given a large database of house sales and statistical/demographic data from public records, predict the sales price of a house.

$$f(\text{size}, \text{rooms}, \text{tax}, \text{neighborhood}, \dots) \rightarrow \text{price}$$

# What's your process?

**Q. What steps would you take to build this component?**



# Exploratory Questions

- What exactly are we trying to model and predict?
- What types of data do we need?
- What type of model works the best for this problem?
- What are the right metrics to evaluate the model performance?
- What is the user actually interested in seeing?
- Will this product actually help with the organizational goals?
- ...

# Data Science: Iteration and Exploration

# Data Science is Iterative and Exploratory



≡ Source: Guo. "Data Science Workflow: Overview and Challenges." Blog@CACM, Oct 2013

# Data Science is Iterative and Exploratory



Martínez-Plumed et al. "CRISP-DM Twenty Years Later: From Data Mining Processes to Data Science Trajectories." IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (2019).

# Data Science is Iterative and Exploratory



# Data Science is Iterative and Exploratory



Source: Patel, Kayur, James Fogarty, James A. Landay, and Beverly Harrison. "[Investigating statistical machine learning as a tool for software development](#)." In Proc. CHI, 2008.

## Speaker notes

This figure shows the result from a controlled experiment in which participants had 2 sessions of 2h each to build a model. Whenever the participants evaluated a model in the process, the accuracy is recorded. These plots show the accuracy improvements over time, showing how data scientists make incremental improvements through frequent iteration.



# Data Science is Iterative and Exploratory

Science mindset: start with rough goal, no clear specification, unclear whether possible

Heuristics and experience to guide the process

Try and error, refine iteratively, hypothesis testing

Go back to data collection and cleaning if needed, revise goals

# Share Experience?



# Different Trajectories



Martínez-Plumed et al. "CRISP-DM Twenty Years Later: From Data Mining Processes to Data Science Trajectories." IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (2019).

# Different Trajectories



From: Martínez-Plumed et al. "CRISP-DM Twenty Years Later: From Data Mining Processes to Data Science Trajectories." IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (2019).

## Speaker notes

- A product to recommend trips connecting tourist attractions in a town may be based on location tracking data collected by navigation and mapping apps. To build such a project, one might start with a concrete goal in mind and explore whether enough user location history data is available or can be acquired. One would then go through traditional data preparation and modeling stages before exploring how to best present the results to users.
- An insurance company tries to improve their model to score the risk of drivers based on their behavior and sensors in their cars. Here an existing product is to be refined and a better understanding of the business case is needed before diving into the data exploration and modeling. The team might spend significant time in exploring new data sources that may provide new insights and may debate the cost and benefits of this data or data gathering strategy (e.g., installing sensors in customer cars).
- A credit card company may want to sell data about what kind of products different people (nationalities) tend to buy at different times and days in different locations to other companies (retailers, restaurants). They may explore existing data without yet knowing what kind of data may be of interest to what kind of customers. They may actively search for interesting narratives in the data, posing questions such as “Ever wondered when the French buy their food?” or “Which places the Germans flock to on their holidays?” in promotional material.



# Computational Notebooks

- Origins in "literate programming", interleaving text and code, treating programs as literature (Knuth'84)
- First notebook in Wolfram Mathematica 1.0 in 1988
- Document with text and code cells, showing execution results under cells
- Code of cells is executed, per cell, in a kernel
- Many notebook implementations and supported languages, Python + Jupyter currently most popular

A screenshot of a Jupyter Notebook cell. The code cell contains the following Python code:

```
# load data collected from team1
import pandas as pd

url = 'http://128.2.25.78:8080/private/log1.clean'
df = pd.read_csv(url)
df.head()
```

The output cell shows the first five rows of a pandas DataFrame:

	dayIdx	user	userAvgTime	location	dow	isWeekend	time
0	0	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	6	True	0.000000
1	1	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	7	True	6.883333
2	2	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	1	False	6.816667
3	3	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	2	False	7.383333
4	4	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	3	False	0.000000

Data was preprocessed externally, identifying the time at a given day when the light was first turned on (12pm). Weather and sunrise information is not included here, though that'd be important. If the light was turned on this morning (quite common), 0 is recorded.

A screenshot of a Jupyter Notebook cell. The code cell contains the following Python code:

```
[ ] # just data encoding and splitting X and Y

X = df.drop(['time'], axis=1)
YnonZero = df['time'] > 0
Y = df['time']

from sklearn import preprocessing
# leDate = preprocessing.LabelEncoder()
# leDate.fit(X['date'])
# leDate.transform(X['date'])

X=X.apply(preprocessing.LabelEncoder().fit_transform)
X
```

## Speaker notes

- See also [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literate\\_programming](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literate_programming)
- Demo with public notebook, e.g., [https://colab.research.google.com/notebooks/mlcc/intro\\_to\\_pandas.ipynb](https://colab.research.google.com/notebooks/mlcc/intro_to_pandas.ipynb)



# Notebooks Support Iteration and Exploration

Quick feedback, similar to REPL

Visual feedback including figures and tables

Incremental computation: reexecuting individual cells

Quick and easy: copy paste, no abstraction needed

Easy to share: document includes text, code, and results

# Brief Discussion: Notebook Limitations and Drawbacks?



# Software Engineering Process

# Software Process

*“The set of activities and associated results that produce a software product”*

*A structured, systematic way of carrying out these activities*

**Q. Examples?**

## Speaker notes

Writing down all requirements  
Require approval for all changes to requirements  
Use version control for all changes  
Track all reported bugs  
Review requirements and code  
Break down development into smaller tasks and schedule and monitor them  
Planning and conducting quality assurance  
Have daily status meetings  
Use Docker containers to push code between developers and operation



# Developers dislike processes



Follow  
Process

Write  
Code



**MOVE  
FAST AND  
BREAK  
THINGS**



We've changed our internal motto  
from "Move fast and break things"  
to "Move fast with stable  
infrastructure."

— *Mark Zuckerberg* —

AZ QUOTES

# Developers' view of processes



## Speaker notes

Complicated processes like these are often what people associate with "process". Software process is needed, but does not need to be complicated.



# What developers want




## Speaker notes

Visualization following McConnell, Steve. Software project survival guide. Pearson Education, 1998.



# What developers want



## Speaker notes

Idea: spent most of the time on coding, accept a little rework



# What developers think of processes



## Speaker notes

negative view of process. pure overhead, reduces productive work, limits creativity



# What eventually happens anyway



## Speaker notes

Real experience if little attention is payed to process: increasingly complicated, increasing rework; attempts to rescue by introducing process



# Survival Mode

Missed deadlines -> "solo development mode" to meet own deadlines

Ignore integration work

Stop interacting with testers, technical writers, managers, ...

-> Results in further project delays, added costs, poor product quality...

# Example of Process Problems?



## Speaker notes

Collect examples of what could go wrong:

Change Control: Mid-project informal agreement to changes suggested by customer or manager. Project scope expands 25-50% Quality Assurance: Late detection of requirements and design issues. Test-debug-reimplement cycle limits development of new features. Release with known defects. Defect Tracking: Bug reports collected informally, forgotten System Integration: Integration of independently developed components at the very end of the project. Interfaces out of sync. Source Code Control: Accidentally overwritten changes, lost work. Scheduling: When project is behind, developers are asked weekly for new estimates.



# Example: Helthcare.gov

The screenshot shows the HealthCare.gov homepage. The top navigation bar includes links for 'Learn', 'Get Insurance', 'Log in', and 'Español'. Below the navigation is a secondary menu with 'Individuals & Families', 'Small Businesses', and 'All Topics'. A search bar with a 'SEARCH' button is also present. The main content area features a large, bold message: 'The System is down at the moment.' followed by a smaller message: 'We're working to resolve the issue as soon as possible. Please try again later.'

- Launched Oct, 2013; high demand (5x expected) causes site crash
- UI incomplete (e.g., missing drop-down menu); missing/incomplete insurance data; log-in system also crashed for IT technicians
- On 1st day, 6 users managed to register
- Initial budget: 93.7M USD; Final cost: 1.7B

# Example: Helthcare.gov

- Lack of experience: "...and project managers had little knowledge on the amount of work required and typical product development processes"
- Lack of leadership: "...no formal division of responsibilities in place...a lack of communication when key decisions were made"
- Schedule pressure: "...employees were pressured to launch on time regardless of completion or the amount (and results) of testing"

*Hypothesis: Process increases flexibility and efficiency + Upfront investment for later greater returns*



## Speaker notes

ideal setting of little process investment upfront





Copyright 1998 Steven C. McConnell. Reprinted with permission  
from *Software Project Survival Guide* (Microsoft Press, 1998).



## Speaker notes

Empirically well established rule: Bugs are increasingly expensive to fix the larger the distance between the phase where they are created vs where they are corrected.



# Software Process Models

# Ad-hoc Processes

1. Discuss the software that needs to be written
2. Write some code
3. Test the code to identify the defects
4. Debug to find causes of defects
5. Fix the defects
6. If not done, return to step 1

# Waterfall Model



≡ Understand requirements, plan & design before coding, test & deploy

## Speaker notes

Although dated, the key idea is still essential -- think and plan before implementing. Not all requirements and design can be made upfront, but planning is usually helpful.



# Problems with Waterfall?



# Risk First: Spiral Model



Incremental prototypes, starting with most risky components

# Constant iteration: Agile



- Constant interactions with customers, constant replanning
- Scrum: Break into *sprints*; daily meetings, sprint reviews, planning





(Image CC BY-SA 4.0, Lakeworks)

# Selecting Process Models

Individually, vote in slack: [1] Ad-hoc [2] Waterfall [3] Spiral [4] Agile  
and write a short justification in #lecture

# Data Science vs Software Engineering

# Discussion: Iteration in Notebook vs Agile?



(CC BY-SA 4.0, Lakeworks)

## Speaker notes

There is similarity in that there is an iterative process, but the idea is different and the process model seems mostly orthogonal to iteration in data science. The spiral model prioritizes risk, especially when it is not clear whether a model is feasible. One can do similar things in model development, seeing whether it is feasible with data at hand at all and build an early prototype, but it is not clear that an initial okay model can be improved incrementally into a great one later. Agile can work with vague and changing requirements, but that again seems to be a rather orthogonal concern. Requirements on the product are not so much unclear or changing (the goal is often clear), but it's not clear whether and how a model can solve it.



# Poor Software Engineering Practices in Notebooks?



A screenshot of a Jupyter Notebook cell. The code cell contains:

```
# load data collected from team1
import pandas as pd

url = 'http://128.2.25.78:8080/private/log1.clean'
df = pd.read_csv(url)
df.head()
```

The output cell shows a Pandas DataFrame with 5 rows and 7 columns:

	dayIdx	user	userAvgTime	location	dow	isWeekend	time
0	0	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	6	True	0.000000
1	1	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	7	True	6.883333
2	2	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	1	False	6.816667
3	3	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	2	False	7.383333
4	4	Pittsburgh66Correy	7.045001	Pittsburgh	3	False	0.000000

Data was preprocessed externally, identifying the time at a given day when the light was first turned on (12pm). Weather and sunrise information is not included here, though that'd be important. If the light was off this morning (quite common), 0 is recorded.

```
[ ] # just data encoding and splitting X and Y

X = df.drop(['time'], axis=1)
YnonZero = df['time'] > 0
Y = df['time']

from sklearn import preprocessing
# leDate = preprocessing.LabelEncoder()
# leDate.fit(X['date'])
```

- Little abstraction
- Global state
- No testing
- Heavy copy and paste
- Little documentation
- Poor version control
- Out of order execution
- Poor development features (vs IDE)

# Understanding Data Scientist Workflows

Instead of blindly recommended "SE Best Practices" understand context

Documentation and testing not a priority in exploratory phase

Help with transitioning into practice

- From notebooks to pipelines
- Support maintenance and iteration once deployed
- Provide infrastructure and tools

# Data Science Practices by Software Eng.

- Many software engineers get involved in data science without explicit training
- Copying from public examples, little reading of documentation
- Lack of data visualization/exploration/understanding, no focus on data quality
- Strong preference for code editors, non-GUI tools
- Improve model by adding more data or changing models, rarely feature engineering or debugging
- Lack of awareness about overfitting/bias problems, single focus on accuracy, no monitoring
- More system thinking about the product and its needs

Yang, Qian, Jina Suh, Nan-Chen Chen, and Gonzalo Ramos. "[Grounding interactive machine learning tool design in how non-experts actually build models](#)." In *Proceedings of the 2018 Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, pp. 573-584. 2018.



A Venn diagram consisting of two overlapping circles. The left circle is light green and contains the text "Data Scientists". The right circle is light orange and contains the text "Software Engineers". The overlapping area between the two circles is shaded in a darker orange.

**Data  
Scientists**

**Software  
Engineers**

# Integrated Process for AI-Enabled Systems



Figure from Dogru, Ali H., and Murat M. Tanik. "A process model for component-oriented software engineering." IEEE Software 20, no. 2 (2003): 34–41.



# Recall: ML models are system components









# Process for AI-Enabled Systems

- Integrate Software Engineering and Data Science processes
- Establish system-level requirements (e.g., user needs, safety, fairness)
- Inform data science modeling with system requirements (e.g., privacy, fairness)
- Try risky parts first (most likely include ML components; ~spiral)
- Incrementally develop prototypes, incorporate user feedback (~agile)
- Provide flexibility to iterate and improve
- Design system with characteristics of AI component (e.g., UI design, safeguards)
- Plan for testing throughout the process and in production
- Manage project understanding both software engineering and data science workflows
- **No existing "best practices" or workflow models**

# Trajectories

Not every project follows the same development process, e.g.

- Small ML addition: Product first, add ML feature later
- Research only: Explore feasibility before thinking about a product
- Data science first: Model as central component of potential product, build system around it

Different focus on system requirements, qualities, and upfront planning

Manage interdisciplinary teams and different expectations

# Technical debt



# Technical Debt Metaphor

Analogy to financial debt

- Make a decision for an immediate benefit (e.g., release now)
- Accepting later cost (loss of productivity, higher maintenance and operating cost, rework)
- Debt accumulates and can suffocate project

Ideally, a deliberate decision (short term tactical or long term strategic)

Ideally, track debt and plan for paying it down later

≡ Q. Examples?

Reckless

*“We don’t have time  
for design”*

Prudent

*“We must ship now  
and deal with  
consequences”*

Deliberate

Inadvertent

*“What’s Layering?”*

*“Now we know how we  
should have done it”*

≡ Source: Martin Fowler 2009, <https://martinfowler.com/bliki/TechnicalDebtQuadrant.html>

# Technical Debt: Examples

Prudent & deliberate: Skip using a CI platform

- Reason for debt: Short deadline; test the product viability with alpha users using a prototype
- Debt payback: Refactoring effort to integrate the system into CI

Reckless & inadvertent: Forget to encrypt user credentials in DB

- Reason for debt: Lack of in-house security expertise
- Debt payback: Security vulnerabilities & fallouts from an attack (loss of data); effort to retrofit security into the system

# Breakout: Technical Debt from ML

As a group in #lecture, tagging members: Post two plausible examples technical debt in housing price prediction system:

1. Deliberate, prudent:
2. Reckless, inadvertent:

# Technical Debt through Notebooks?

*Jupyter Notebooks are a gift from God to those who work with data. They allow us to do quick experiments with Julia, Python, R, and more -- John Paul Ada*

## Speaker notes

Discuss benefits and drawbacks of Jupyter style notebooks



# ML and Technical Debt

**Often reckless and inadvertent in inexperienced teams**

ML can seem like an easy addition, but it may cause long-term costs

Needs to be maintained, evolved, and debugged

Goals may change, environment may change, some changes are subtle

# Example problems: ML and Technical Debt

- Systems and models are tangled and changing one has cascading effects on the other
- Untested, brittle infrastructure; manual deployment
- Unstable data dependencies, replication crisis
- Data drift and feedback loops
- Magic constants and dead experimental code paths

Further reading: Sculley, David, et al. [Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems](#). Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2015.

# Controlling Technical Debt from ML Components



# Controlling Technical Debt from ML Components

- Avoid AI when not needed
- Understand and document requirements, design for mistakes
- Build reliable and maintainable pipelines, infrastructure, good engineering practices
- Test infrastructure, system testing, testing and monitoring in production
- Test and monitor data quality
- Understand and model data dependencies, feedback loops, ...
- Document design intent and system architecture
- Strong interdisciplinary teams with joint responsibilities
- Document and track technical debt
- ...

Buy Rent Sell Home Loans Agent finder



Manage Rentals Advertise Help Sign in



Reimagine home

We'll help you find a place you'll love.

Enter an address, neighborhood, city, or ZIP c...



# Summary

Data scientists and software engineers follow different processes

ML projects need to consider process needs of both

Iteration and upfront planning are both important, process models codify good practices

Deliberate technical debt can be good, too much debt can suffocate a project

Easy to amount (reckless) technical debt with machine learning

# Further Reading

- Sculley, David, Gary Holt, Daniel Golovin, Eugene Davydov, Todd Phillips, Dietmar Ebner, Vinay Chaudhary, Michael Young, Jean-Francois Crespo, and Dan Dennison. "[Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems](#)." In Advances in neural information processing systems, pp. 2503-2511. 2015.
- Studer, Stefan, Thanh Binh Bui, Christian Drescher, Alexander Hanuschkin, Ludwig Winkler, Steven Peters, and Klaus-Robert Mueller. "[Towards CRISP-ML \(Q\): A Machine Learning Process Model with Quality Assurance Methodology](#)." arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.05155 (2020).
- Martínez-Plumed, Fernando, et al. "[CRISP-DM Twenty Years Later: From Data Mining Processes to Data Science Trajectories](#)." IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (2019).
-  Kaestner, Christian. [On the process for building software with ML components](#). Blog Post, 2020

# Further Reading 2

- Patel, Kayur, James Fogarty, James A. Landay, and Beverly Harrison. "[Investigating statistical machine learning as a tool for software development.](#)" In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 667-676. 2008.
- Yang, Qian, Jina Suh, Nan-Chen Chen, and Gonzalo Ramos. "[Grounding interactive machine learning tool design in how non-experts actually build models.](#)" In *Proceedings of the 2018 Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, pp. 573-584. 2018.
-  Fowler and Highsmith. [The Agile Manifesto](#)
- Steve McConnell. Software project survival guide. Chapter 3
- Pfleeger and Atlee. Software Engineering: Theory and Practice. Chapter 2
- Kruchten, Philippe, Robert L. Nord, and Ipek Ozkaya. "[Technical debt: From metaphor to theory and practice.](#)" *IEEE Software* 29, no. 6 (2012): 18-21.

