Outbrief

7th Annual Practical Software and Systems Measurement Users' Group Conference
Keystone, CO
July 18, 2003

Ricardo Valerdi – *USC Center for Software Engineering*

Workshop Agenda

Day 1 (1:30 PM – 5:00 PM 7/16)

- Next-level tutorial
- Review of drivers
- SE Sizing discussion
- Tool demo

Day 2 (8:30 AM – 4:30 PM 7/17)

- Action item review from February meeting
- Discussion of key driver issues
- Data collection form
- Data collection lessons learned
- Possible data sources
- COSYSMO Trade Study
- Delphi exercise

Main Accomplishments

- Addressed driver issues and converged on revisions
  - Key Performance Parameters was kept as a cost driver
- Agreed on difference between size and cost drivers
- Tool demo
- Developed sizing guide for:
  - # of Requirements
  - # of Interfaces
- Telecon w/other working group members
- Modified data collection instrument
- Updated on COSYSMO Trade Study implementation
- Performed 2 rounds of Delphi survey

Participants

Garry Roedler, LMCO
Rick Edison, LMCO
Gary Hafen, LMCO
John Gaffney, LMCO
Carl Newman, LMCO
Evin Stump, Galorath
Janice Day, General Dynamics
George Georgaras, General Dynamics
Paul Mohlman, Aerospace
Tom Solosky, DCMA
Bob MacIver, SPC
Luis Henriquez, US Army
Gary Thomas, Raytheon
Aaron Silver, Raytheon
Rob Flowe, DAU
Barry Boehm, USC
Don Reifer, USC
Ricardo Valerdi, USC

Marilee Wheaton, Aerospace
Paul Stelling, Aerospace
Arnie Kravits, BAE
Don Greenlee, SAIC
John Reiff, Raytheon
Chris Miller, SPC
Gunter Daley, L3

via teleconference

Size Drivers vs. Effort Multipliers

- Size Drivers: Additive, Incremental
  - Impact of adding a new item inversely proportional to current size

    10 → 11 rqts = 10% increase

    100 → 101 rqts = 1% increase
- Effort Multipliers: Multiplicative, system-wide
  - Impact of adding a new item independent of current size

    10 rqts + high security = 40% increase

    100 rqts + high security = 40% increase

Action Items

1. Develop "short form" version of the Delphi instrument
2. Update application domain categories to include INCOSE and DoD
3. Include more commercially-oriented examples in Delphi form
4. Update Size drivers to reflect data collection effort vs. cost estimation effort
5. Incorporate new direction of IEEE 1220, ISO/IEC 15288, and EIA/ANSI 632 life cycle stages
6. Follow up with BAE's SE estimation efforts in New Hampshire
7. Continue work on "Technology Maturity" driver and include NASA/DARPA Technology Readiness Levels
8. Update "# of Critical Algorithms" driver