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## They Scare Me!

- Fearing the User-Defined Function
- The syntax confuses me
- I'm not using a generalized algebraic equation
- They are impossible to debug
- No time to "plan for change"
- I prefer copy/paste
- Too late to use one now



## Why? Why Not!

- Embracing the UDF
- Capture \& reuse strategies
- Avoid repeated repetition
- Isolate \& localize complexity
- Document intentions
- Facilitate flexibility
- Earlier is always easier



## Quick Example

- Rows below contain a common estimating strategy
- To alter the strategy- ALL rows must be edited
- If the strategy was isolated to a UDF—edit ONE row
- Plus, easier to review CER intention with UDF



## UDF Nuts \& Bolts



## What /S a UDF?

- You create a User-Defined Function (UDF) to:
- Centralize a repeated calculation
- Separate control from cost calculations
- Hide details so that changes are easier
- A UDF is defined on a single row in your session.
- But, a UDF row is never evaluated.
- Instead, it is evaluated inside other rows' equations.
- A UDF behaves just like a Built-In ACE function
- Arguments and result are in row's units (wrapped)
- Common Error: Assuming UDF is in Session Units


## UDF Declaration

■ A UDF Consists of Four (4) Parts [in 3 columns]:

- Description-to distinguish it from a comment row
- Unique ID—must be unique to whole session
- Argument List—values used in its equation
- Equation-the math used to produce a result

Only three columns are active on a UDF row

|  | WBS/CES Description | Unique ID | Point Estimate | h | Equation / Throughput |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | UDF - Fuel Costs | Fuel\$(Miles, MPG, PerGal\$) |  |  | Miles * PerGal\$ / MPG |
| 21 | UDF: Trucate unless close | Truncate(uNum) |  |  | RndDn(uNum + 0.05) |

Two parts to UDF declaration

- name \& list of arguments


## UDF Evaluation

- Think "Inline Substitution" (almost)
- You can "insert" a UDF into equation and get the same result
- This metaphor helps visualize context of UDF calculation
- It is important to note that numbers are substituted—not text


Example from ACE Help topic "User Defined Functions"

## Evaluation Walkthrough



## ID Visibility

- UDF with same name hides built-in function
- Useful if you don't like how ACE implemented a function
- Not recommended due to ambiguity and confusion it causes

| WBS/CES Description | Unique ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Point } \\ & \text { Estimate } \end{aligned}$ | P | Equation / Throughput |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| My Rounding UDF | RndDn(a) |  |  | Rnd(a-0.05) |

- UDF argument with same name hides Unique ID
- A necessary evil--Beware of the confusion that may arise
- Sharing names among UDFs is a good thing (limited scope)



## Addressing @

## (How to impersonate a row ID)



## Problem: Built-In @Arguments

- Some ACE functions need a row address: FycMax(@Row)
- Yet, a UDF translates its arguments to numbers
- And you cannot apply an "@" operation to a number



## Solution: UDF @Arguments

- Define argument to accept a row address wl @ prefix
- This is a number specially marked to access another row's results
- The argument name is an alias for the row number passed in
- It's like creating a temporary row ID that is used only inside of UDF

|  | WBS/CES Description | Appro, Inique ID | Point Estimate | P | Equation / Throughput |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48 | Total | Total | 115.000 * | F | FYFACT |  |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54 | Proper @ Declare | Right(@Row, Val) |  |  | Val * FYCMax(@Row) |  |
| 55 | Proper Usage |  | 36.000 * | C | Right(@Total, 1.2) |  |

Inline Substitution:
1.2 * FYCMax(@Total)
@Argument Example

|  | WBS/CES Description | Unique ID | Point <br> Estimate | P <br> h | Equation / Throughput |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## IfFYYR<=C\$\$\$.LastYr, C\$\$\$, FYCMax(@C\$\$\$))

"Dot" Attribute

> "Value" of C\$\$\$

> "@" Reference

|  | Cost Element | Approp | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2011 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2013 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Total |  | 115.000 |  | 10.000 | 20.00 | 30.000 | 20.000 | 25.000 | 10.000 |  |  |  |  |
|  | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ..... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Use @ UDF |  | 235.000 |  | 10.000 | 20.000 | 30.000 | 20.000 | 25.000 |  | 30.000 | 30.000 | 30.000 | 30.000 |
| 11 | UDF - Out years receive max |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comp Sci in 15 Minutes



## What I learned in CS



- Change is Inevitable-especially when assured otherwise
- Refine through Iteration-nothing is ever complete
- Hide Details-expose intent and expectations
- Test Early and Often-hope springs eternal bugs
- Determine, Capture and Isolate Strategies

If I had asked people what they wanted, they would have said faster horses.

- Henry Ford


## Hiding "How"... Abstraction

■ Layer details of a strategy under an interface


- Shows what is expected (e.g. argument, context)
> The row populates the UDF arguments
- Hides how it is implemented (i.e. math)
> The UDF equation implements the math "behind the scenes"
Travel\$(Distance, FuelRate, MPG)

How Travel\$ is calculated is hidden away on another row

## - Advantages:

- Change underlying calculation at any time ('cause it's hidden)
- Use UDF instead of copying, decoding \& modifying its math
- Verifying a CER's intent just got a lot easier


## Isolate and Refine... Iteration

- Introduce UDFs earlier rather than later
- Your UDF does not have to be a finished product
- You can always come back to refine your thinking
- In this way, you only have one place to refine (or repair)



## Building Blocks... Reusability

- Build Building Blocks of UDFs

- Even a simple build-up easier to interpret as a UDF
- Ex: Suppose "Area" is common in a session's build-ups:

| $7.1 * 3.55 * 7.25$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $.4^{*}(2.5 * 7.25)^{\wedge} .5$ | Material\$(7.1, Area(3.55, 7.25)) |
| Labor\$(0.4, Area(2.5, 7.25)) |  |

- UDFs are much easier to borrow than CERs
- No need to hunt through equation to replace variables
- Hint: Check out "Section Templates" in ACE help


## Bookkeeping... Encapsulation

- Separate decision-control from WBS/CES

- IF() and SEL() are best stashed elsewhere
- For instance...
> selecting among several values,
> filtering values based on type,
> applying adjustments (nudges, fudges or errors),
> boundary tests and corrections
- Watch for patterns developing in WBS
- Ask if the row has a need to know
- If not, decouple decision-control from cost calculation


## Bookkeeping Example

- User wanted zeroes to appear in phased reports

- Every Row in WBS contained following logic:
IF([CER]>0, [CER], 0.0001)
- But this logic isn't "row specific" -- unimportant to row
- Cannot "turn off" behavior without editing every equation in WBS
- Recommend abstraction/encapsulation:
- Each row's CER becomes...
ShowZero([CER])
- Row requests zeroes in report but doesn't control report setting.

UDF: ShowZero $(X)=I F(X>0, X, I F($ Hide, $0,0.0001))$

## UDF Design Tips



## Hunting For Repetition

- Don't try to guess what you need
- Let the session structure emerge first
- But watch for repetition-tendency to copy/paste/edit rows
- Introduce UDF on next refinement iteration
- Judicious pattern matching
- Identify the calculation strategy that rows have in common
$>$ Not just the arithmetic symbols in common
> Not just a list of different unique IDs
- You need to identify 3 things:

1) Which part of the row's equation is in common
2) Which parts vary from row to row
3) Which values to pass in instead of calculate internally

## Example of 3 Parts

- The two rows below have obvious similarities

- The whole CER can be converted to a UDF
- no row-specific fringe to leave behind
. 07 - Detailed LC...logy (BY2010\$K)

|  | WBS/CES Description | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Appr} \\ \mathrm{op} \end{gathered}$ | Unique ID | Point Estimate | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ph} \\ & \mathrm{asi} \end{aligned}$ | S | Equation / Throughput | Fi Y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 172 | Continuing System Improvements |  |  | \$ 5,276.552 (25\%) * |  |  |  |  |
| 173 | Hardware Modifications or Modernization | 3400 |  | \$ 1,978.707 (28\%)* | F | 1 | If(Mod(FYYR-OSFirstYr,HWModYrs) = 0, FYTot(@AVS) * HWMod\%, 0) |  |
| 174 | Software Maintenance and Modifications | 3400 |  | \$ 3,297.845 (28\%) * | F | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { If(Mod(FYYR-OSFirstYr,SWModYrs) }= \\ 0, \text { FYTot }(@ A V S) * \operatorname{SWMod} \%, 0) \end{array}$ |  |

- 2 parts vary from row to row
- HWModYrs \& SWModYrs
- HWMod\% \& SWMod\%
- But is that our strategy?



## Example of 3 Parts (cont)

- There are two equally viable "strategies" here.
- One expects the \% of AV\$, the other the actual cost:

ContImpr\$(ModYrs, Mod\$)

- It isn't always in your best interest to pass in the rudimentary variables and do all the calculation in the UDF.
- Which to use depends on where the session is heading.
- Passing a cost is more general but requires an intermediate calc.
- If $A V \$$ is always used, the intermediate calc clutters the row.

Usage: ContImpr\$(SWModYrs, AV\$.FYTot * SWMod\%)

- Passing a Mod\% encapsulates the intermediate calc in the UDF.
- But the UDF is only useful when improvement depends on AV\$.

Usage: ContImpr\$(SWModYrs, SWMod\%)

## Example 2 - Buildup

- Remember the "Area()" building block?

- Did we really need Area() UDF?
- Is it our strategy?
- Do we plan to use it elsewhere?
- More sense to calculate directly?
- Should we pass dimensions into UDF?

Usage: Labor\$(0.4, Area(2.5, 7.25))

Usage: Labor\$(0.4, 2.5 * 7.25)

Usage: Labor\$(0.4, 2.5, 7.25)

## UDF Naming Tips

- Describe the result in the UDF name

- This is called self-documenting and is a cool CS technique
- Avoid using names that differ by only a letter or two

| Unique ID | Equation / Throughput |
| ---: | ---: |
| OP(A,B,C) | $A^{*} \operatorname{Max}\left(1.0,(A / B)^{\wedge}(1+C)\right)$ |
| PenalizeOverrun(Cost, Thresh\$, PenAdj) | Cost * Max(1.0, (Cost/Thresh\$)^(1+PenAdj)) |

- Use descriptive words (or abbrvs) for argument names
- Names are local, so you can use short names
- Avoid using 1-2 letter names for arguments
- Include expected units in name to clarify how to call UDF
$\operatorname{Sin}(X) \square \operatorname{Sin}($ Angle $) \square \square \operatorname{Sin}$ (Radians)


## UDF Toolbox



## Access "Dotted" Value

- Problem: Can't access dotted value
- Syntax won't let you get to DEC with row offset


## (@Row+X).aStartDate + Duration

- Solution: UDF that takes row and returns value:
- Note: You would need one UDF for each DEC


Adding an Argument

- What if you realize that you need another variable passed into your UDF?
- Add new name to the front of argument list
> Replace UDF name and open parentheses with default "placeholder" value as shown below.
> Don't forget the separating comma!


DEC as Backdoor Argument

- Use DECs as "backdoor" arguments
- Reduces clutter in the "Equ/Thrupt" cell
- Fewer arguments to declare and pass into UDF
- Useful for flags, type arguments, and WBS row offsets
- Opens the way for category filtering using SUMIF()

|  | WBS/CES Description | Unique ID | Equation / Throughput | Rd (!) Radius | Len (!) Length | Wth (!) Width | Point Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73 | Wood \$/sf | Wood\$sf | 3.0 |  |  |  | 3.0 * |
| 74 | Iron \$/sf | Iron\$sf | 5.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 * |
| 76 | Wood Tube |  | Tube(Wood\$sf) | 2 | 4 |  | 150.8* |
| 77 | Iron Tube |  | Tube(Iron\$sf) | 1 | 8 |  | 251.3* |
| 78 | Wood Board |  | Rect(Wood\$sf) |  | 3 | 4 | 36.0 * |
| 79 | Iron Plate |  | Rect(Iron\$sf) |  | 3 | 5 | 75.0 * |
| 81 | UDF - tube | Tube(sf\$) | sf\$*6.283*Rd*Len |  |  |  |  |
| 82 | UDF - Rect | Rect(sf\$) | sf\$*Wth*Len |  |  |  |  |

## Performance Concerns



## UDF Performance

- Yes, UDF is slower than direct evaluation
- Count on row calc time to roughly double (WAG)
- That means if $20 \%$ of rows use a UDF, your session will take $20 \%$ longer to calculate.
- Yes, DEC is slower than no DEC
- Count on row calc time to roughly double
- That means if $20 \%$ of rows use DECs, your session will take $20 \%$ longer to calculate.
- Higher math: Using both UDFs and DECs
- If $20 \%$ of rows use both, calculation takes $60 \%$ longer!


## Performance Tuning

- Some time savings found when...
- UDF has fewer arguments
- UDF uses short argument names (dissimilar prefix)
- Intermediate calculations performed as argument
> E.g., MyFunc( $\left.X^{*} B^{\wedge} E, 1.2 / B\right)$
> AND when argument used multiple times in UDF
■ For "F" method rows, consider using Start/Finish years.
- For RI\$K calculations...
- Default to small number of iterations for "Draft" reports.
- Set large number of iterations in "Final" reports.


## Troubleshooting Tips



## Tips for Testing

- The first rule in testing is...

- Know the answer before you run the test.
- Start by assuming that you did something wrong.
- If you did it right, it would work.
- Mistakes hide well within one's certainty.
- Look for stupid stuff first.
- Use Traceback dialog or hover tips to verify variable descriptions.
- Make sure "@" usage matches UDF declaration.

Computers have the annoying habit of doing exactly what they are told.

- CS Proverb


## Tips for Testing

- Check assumptions of UDF equation.

- Expect to be used on "C" or "F" method? Costs in certain units?
- Work from inside out.
- Find a place where you get known, desired behavior.
- Then, work outwards until expectation fails.
- Isolate in separate, small session file.
- Get away from the clutter of a complex session.
- Makes it easier to dissect UDF without breaking calculation.
- Beware of RI\$K.
- Does distribution approach zero? Can value become negative?
- Remember UDF evaluation sequence:
- Resolve argument values, insert values into UDF, insert UDF into row/cell equation.


## In Review

■ UDFs aren't just for math majors

- Use UDFs to centralize cost \& control strategies
- CS concepts of "Abstraction" and "Reuse"
- Remember "inline substitution" metaphor
- UDF takes on context of row's (cell's) using it

■ Test UDFs by isolating them—go from inside out

- Don't worry too much about performance
- The more you use them, the easier they become

