



**Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive**  
**DSpace Repository**

---

Faculty and Researchers

Faculty and Researchers' Publications

---

2011-07

# Future Software Sizing Metrics and Estimation Challenges

Boehm, Barry; Clark, Brad; Tan, Thomas; Madachy,  
Raymond; Wilson, Rosa

---

Boehm, Barry, et al. Future software sizing metrics and estimation challenges.  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY CA DEPT OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING, 2011.  
<https://hdl.handle.net/10945/60712>

---

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

*Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun*



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School**  
**411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle**  
**Monterey, California USA 93943**

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

# Future Software Sizing Metrics and Estimation Challenges

Barry Boehm, Brad Clark, Thomas Tan  
USC Center for Systems and Software Engineering  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA, USA  
boehm@usc.edu, brad@software-metrics.com,  
thomast@usc.edu

Raymond Madachy  
Department of Systems Engineering  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA, USA  
rjmadach@nps.edu

Wilson Rosa  
Information Technology Division  
Air Force Cost Analysis Agency  
Arlington, VA, USA  
Wilson.Rosa@pentagon.af.mil

**Abstract**—In the dynamic software field there are major challenges in adapting metrics and cost estimation methods to continuing changes. There is a need to assess emerging trends and re-interpret software size measures and estimation models for new processes. Future trends of software systems are overviewed with implications for software sizing and cost estimation capabilities. Methods are shown to handle some of these effects, but many software variabilities remain uncovered.

**Keywords:** *software sizing, metrics, cost estimation, systems of systems, net-centric systems, model-driven development, agile processes*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Several future trends will present significant challenges for the sizing and cost estimation of 21st century software systems. Prominent among these trends are:

1. Rapid change, emergent requirements, and evolutionary development
2. Net-centric systems of systems
3. Model-Driven and Non-Developmental Item (NDI)-intensive systems
4. Ultrahigh software system assurance
5. Legacy maintenance and Brownfield development
6. Agile and Lean/Kanban development.

This paper summarizes an ongoing US Government-sponsored analysis of these trends, and summarizes the highlights of an ISERN 2010 panel discussion of future challenges.

## II. RAPID CHANGE, EMERGENT REQUIREMENTS, AND EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT

21st century software systems will encounter increasingly rapid change in their objectives, constraints, and priorities. This change will be necessary due to increasingly rapid changes in their competitive threats, technology, organizations, leadership priorities, and environments. It is thus increasingly infeasible to provide precise size and cost

estimates if the systems' requirements are emergent rather than pre-specifiable. This has led to increasing use of strategies such as incremental and evolutionary development, and to experiences with associated new sizing and costing phenomena such as the Incremental Development Productivity Decline. It also implies that measuring the system's size by counting the number of source lines of code (SLOC) in the delivered system may be an underestimate, as a good deal of software may be developed and deleted before delivery due to changing priorities.

There are three primary options for handling these sizing and estimation challenges. The first is to improve the ability to estimate requirements volatility during development via improved data collection and analysis, such as the use of code counters able to count numbers of SLOC added, modified, and deleted during development [1]. If such data is unavailable, the best one can do is to estimate ranges of requirements volatility.

For incremental and evolutionary development projects, the second option is to treat the earlier increments as reused software, and to apply reuse factors to them (such as the percent of the design, code, and integration modified, perhaps adjusted for degree of software understandability and programmer unfamiliarity [2]). This can be done either uniformly across the set of previous increments, or by having these factors vary by previous increment or by subsystem. This will produce an equivalent-SLOC (ESLOC) size for the effect of modifying the previous increments, to be added to the size of the new increment in estimating effort for the new increment. In tracking the size of the overall system, it is important to remember that these ESLOC are not actual lines of code to be included in the size of the next release.

The third option is to include an Incremental Development Productivity Decline (IDPD) factor, or perhaps multiple factors varying by increment or subsystem. Unlike hardware, where unit costs tend to decrease with added production volume, the unit costs of later software increments tend to increase, due to previous-increment breakage and usage feedback, and due to increased

## Report Documentation Page

*Form Approved*  
*OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>11 JUL 2011</b>	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2011 to 00-00-2011</b>			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Future Software Sizing Metrics and Estimation Challenges</b>		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER			
6. AUTHOR(S)		5b. GRANT NUMBER			
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER			
		5d. PROJECT NUMBER			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>University of Southern California, Center for Systems and Software Engineering, Los Angeles, CA, 90089</b>		5e. TASK NUMBER			
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER			
		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER			
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)			
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)			
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES <b>15th Annual Practical Systems and Software Measurement (PSM) Users' Group Conference, Mystic, CT, 11-15 July 2011.</b>					
14. ABSTRACT <b>In the dynamic software field there are major challenges in adapting metrics and cost estimation methods to continuing changes. There is a need to assess emerging trends and re-interpret software size measures and estimation models for new processes. Future trends of software systems are overviewed with implications for software sizing and cost estimation capabilities. Methods are shown to handle some of these effects, but many software variabilities remain uncovered.</b>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>7</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

integration and test effort. Thus, using hardware-driven or traditional software-driven estimation methods for later increments will lead to underestimates and overruns in both cost and schedule.

A relevant example was a large defense software system that had the following characteristics:

- 5 builds, 7 years, \$100M
- Build 1 producibility over 300 SLOC/person-month
- Build 5 producibility under 150 SLOC/person-month
  - Including Build 1-4 breakage, integration, rework
  - 318% change in requirements across all builds.

A factor-of-2 decrease in producibility across four new builds corresponds to an average build-to-build IDPD factor of 19%. A recent quantitative IDPD analysis of a smaller software system yielded an IDPD of 14%, with significant variations from increment to increment [3]. Similar IDPD phenomena have been found for large commercial software such as the multi-year slippages in the delivery of Microsoft’s Word for Windows [4] and Windows Vista, and for large agile-development projects that assumed a zero IDPD factor[5].

Based on experience with similar projects, the following impact causes and ranges per increment are conservatively stated in Table 1.

TABLE I. IDPD EFFORT DRIVERS

<b>Less effort due to more experienced personnel, assuming reasonable initial experience level</b>	
Variation depending on personnel turnover rates	5-20%
<b>More effort due to code base growth</b>	
Breakage, maintenance of full code base	20-40%
Diseconomies of scale in development, integration	10-25%
Requirements volatility, user requests	10-25%

In the best case, there would be 20% more effort (from above -20+20+10+10); for a 4-build system, the IDPD would be 6%.

In the worst case, there would be 85% more effort (from above 40+25+25-5); for a 4-build system, the IDPD would be 23%.

In any case, with fixed staff size, there would be either a schedule increase or incomplete builds. The difference between 6% and 23% may not look too serious, but the cumulative effect on schedule across a number of builds is very serious.

A simplified illustrative model relating productivity decline to number of builds needed to reach 4M ESLOC across 4 builds follows. Assume that the two year Build 1 production of 1M SLOC can be developed at 200 SLOC/PM. This means it will need 208 developers (500 PM/ 24 mo.). Assuming a constant staff size of 208 for all builds, the analysis shown in Figure 1 shows the impact on the amount of software delivered per build and the resulting effect on the overall delivery schedule as a function of the IDPD factor. Many incremental development cost estimates assume an

IDPD of zero, and an on-time delivery of 4M SLOC in 4 builds. However, as the IDPD factor increases and the staffing level remains constant, the productivity decline per build stretches the schedule out to twice as long for an IDPD of 20%.

Thus, it is important to understand the IDPD factor and its influence when doing incremental or evolutionary development. Ongoing research indicates that the magnitude of the IDPD factor may vary by type of application (infrastructure software having higher IDPDs since it tends to be tightly coupled and touches everything; applications software having lower IDPDs if it is architected to be loosely coupled), or by recency of the build (older builds may be more stable). Further data collection and analysis would be very helpful in improving the understanding of the IDPD factor.




Figure 1. Effects of IDPD on Number of Builds to achieve 4M SLOC

### III. 2. NET-CENTRIC SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS (NCSOS)

If one is developing software components for use in a NCSoS, changes in the interfaces between the component systems and independently-evolving NCSoS-internal or NCSoS-external systems will add further effort. The amount of effort may vary by the tightness of the coupling among the systems; the complexity, dynamism, and compatibility of purpose of the independently-evolving systems; and the degree of control that the NCSoS protagonist has over the various component systems. The latter ranges from Directed SoS (strong control), through Acknowledged (partial control) and Collaborative (shared interests) SoSs, to Virtual SoSs (no guarantees) [6].

For estimation, one option is to use requirements volatility as a way to assess increased effort. Another is to use existing models such as COSYSMO [7] to estimate the added coordination effort across the NCSoS [8]. A third approach is to have separate models for estimating the systems engineering, NCSoS component systems development, and NCSoS component systems integration to estimate the added effort [7].

### IV. 3. MODEL-DRIVEN AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL ITEM (NDI)-INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

Model-driven development and Non-Developmental Item (NDI)-intensive development are two approaches that enable

large portions of software-intensive systems to be generated from model directives or provided by NDIs such as commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) components, open source components, and purchased services such as Cloud services. Figure 2 shows recent trends in the growth of COTS-based applications (CBAs) [10] and services-intensive systems [11] in the area of web-based e-services.




Figure 2. COTS and Services-Intensive Systems Growth in USC E- Services Projects

Such applications are highly cost-effective, but present several sizing and cost estimation challenges:

- Model directives generate source code in Java, C++, or other third-generation languages, but unless the generated SLOC are going to be used for system maintenance, their size as counted by code counters should not be used for development or maintenance cost estimation.
- Counting model directives is possible for some types of model-driven development, but presents significant challenges for others (e.g., GUI builders).
- Except for customer-furnished or open-source software that is expected to be modified, the size of NDI components should not be used for estimating.
- A significant challenge is to find appropriately effective size measures for such NDI components. One approach is to use the number and complexity of their interfaces with each other or with the software being developed. Another is to count the amount of glue-code SLOC being developed to integrate the NDI components, with the proviso that such glue code tends to be about 3 times as expensive per SLOC as regularly-developed code

[12]. A similar approach is to use the interface elements of function points for sizing [13].

- A further challenge is that much of the effort in using NDI is expended in assessing candidate NDI components and in tailoring them to the given application. Some initial guidelines for estimating such effort are provided in the COCOTS model [14].
- Another challenge is that the effects of COTS and Cloud-services evolution are generally underestimated during software maintenance. COTS products generally provide significant new releases on the average of about every 10 months, and generally become unsupported after three new releases. With Cloud services, one does not have the option to decline new releases, and updates occur more frequently. One way to estimate this source of effort is to consider it as a form of requirements volatility.
- Another serious concern is that functional size measures such as function points, use cases, or requirements will be highly unreliable until it is known how much of the functionality is going to be provided by NDI components or Cloud services.

#### V. 4. ULTRAHIGH SOFTWARE SYSTEMS ASSURANCE

The increasing criticality of software to the safety of transportation vehicles, medical equipment, or financial resources; the security of private or confidential information; and the assurance of “24/7” Internet, web, or Cloud services will require further investments in the development and certification of software than are provided by most current software-intensive systems.

While it is widely held that ultrahigh-assurance software will substantially raise software-project cost, different models vary in estimating the added cost. For example, [15] estimates that engineering highly-secure software will increase costs by a factor of 8; the 1990’s Softcost-R model estimates a factor of 3.43 [16][16]; the SEER model uses a similar value of 3.47 [13].

A recent experimental extension of the COCOMO II model called COSECMO used the 7 Evaluated Assurance Levels (EALs) in the ISO Standard Common Criteria for Information Technology Security Evaluation (CC) [ISO 1999], and quoted prices for certifying various EAL security levels to provide an initial estimation model in this context [18]. Its added-effort estimates were a function of both EAL level and software size: its multipliers for a 5000-SLOC secure system were 1.50 for EAL 4 and 8.8 for EAL 7.

A further sizing challenge for ultrahigh-assurance software is that it requires more functionality for such functions as security audit, communication, cryptographic support, data protection, etc. These may be furnished by NDI components or may need to be developed for special systems.

## VI. 5. LEGACY MAINTENANCE AND BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT

Fewer and fewer software-intensive systems have the luxury of starting with a clean sheet of paper or whiteboard on which to create a new Greenfield system. Most software-intensive systems are already in maintenance; The International Data Corporation estimates that there are roughly 200 billion SLOC in service worldwide [19]. Also, most new applications need to consider continuity of service from the legacy system(s) they are replacing. Many such applications involving incremental development have failed because there was no way to separate out the incremental legacy system capabilities that were being replaced. Thus, such applications need to use a Brownfield development approach that concurrently architect the new version and its increments, while re-engineering the legacy software to accommodate the incremental phase-in of the new capabilities [20] [21] [22].

Traditional software maintenance sizing models have determined an equivalent SLOC size by multiplying the size of the legacy system by its Annual Change Traffic (ACT) fraction (% of SLOC added + % of SLOC modified)/100. The resulting equivalent size is used to determine a nominal cost of a year of maintenance, which is then adjusted by maintenance-oriented effort multipliers. These are generally similar or the same as those for development, except for some, such as required reliability and degree of documentation, in which larger development investments will yield relative maintenance savings. Some models such as SEER [13] include further maintenance parameters such as personnel and environment differences. An excellent summary of software maintenance estimation is in [20].

However, as legacy systems become larger and larger (a full-up BMW contains roughly 100 million SLOC [24]), the ACT approach becomes less stable. The difference between an ACT of 1% and an ACT of 2% when applied to 100 million SLOC is 1 million SLOC. A recent revision of the COCOMO II software maintenance model sizes a new release as  $ESLOC = 2 * (\text{Modified SLOC}) + \text{Added SLOC} + 0.5 * (\text{Deleted SLOC})$ . The coefficients are rounded values determined from the analysis of data from 24 maintenance activities [Nguyen, 2010], in which the modified, added, and deleted SLOC were obtained from a code counting tool. This model can also be used to estimate the equivalent size of re-engineering legacy software in Brownfield software development. At first, the estimates of legacy SLOC modified, added, and deleted will be very rough, and can be refined as the design of the maintenance modifications or Brownfield re-engineering is determined.

## VII. 6. AGILE AND LEAN/KANBAN DEVELOPMENT

The difficulties of software maintenance estimation can often be mitigated by using lean workflow management techniques such as Kanban [25]. In Kanban, individual maintenance upgrades are given Kanban cards (Kanban is the Japanese word for card; the approach originated with the Toyota Production System). Workflow management is

accomplished by limiting the number of cards introduced into the development process, and pulling the cards into the next stage of development (design, code, test, release) when open capacity is available (each stage has a limit of the number of cards it can be processing at a given time). Any buildups of upgrade queues waiting to be pulled forward are given management attention to find and fix bottleneck root causes or to rebalance the manpower devoted to each stage of development. A key Kanban principle is to minimize work in progress.

An advantage of Kanban is that if upgrade requests are relatively small and uniform, that there is no need to estimate their required effort; they are pulled through the stages as capacity is available, and if the capacities of the stages are well-tuned to the traffic, work gets done on schedule. However, if a too-large upgrade is introduced into the system, it is likely to introduce delays as it progresses through the stages. Thus, some form of estimation is necessary to determine right-size upgrade units, but it does not have to be precise as long as the workflow management pulls the upgrade through the stages. For familiar systems, performers will be able to right-size the units. For Kanban in less-familiar systems, and for sizing builds in agile methods such as Scrum, group consensus techniques such as Planning Poker [26] or Wideband Delphi [27] can generally serve this purpose.

The key point is to recognize that estimation of knowledge work can never be perfect, and to create development approaches that compensate for variations in estimation accuracy. Kanban is one such; another is the agile methods' approach of timeboxing or schedule-as-independent-variable (SAIV), in which maintenance upgrades or incremental development features are prioritized, and the increment architected to enable dropping of features to meet a fixed delivery date (With Kanban, prioritization occurs in determining which of a backlog of desired upgrade features gets the next card).

Such prioritization is a form of value-based software engineering, in that the higher-priority features can be flowed more rapidly through Kanban stages [24], or in general given more attention in defect detection and removal via value-based inspections or testing [28] [29]. Another important point is that the ability to compensate for rough estimates does not mean that data on project performance does not need to be collected and analyzed. It is even more important as a sound source of continuous improvement and change adaptability efforts.

## VIII. 7. PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER AT THE LARGE-PROJECT OR ENTERPRISE LEVEL

The biggest challenge of all is that the six challenges above need to be addressed concurrently. Suboptimizing on individual-project agility runs the risks of easiest-first lock-in to unscalable or unsecurable systems, or of producing numerous incompatible stovepipe applications. Suboptimizing on security assurance and certification runs the risks of missing early-adopter market windows, of

rapidly responding to competitive threats, or of creating inflexible, user-unfriendly systems.

One key strategy for addressing such estimation and performance challenges is to recognize that large systems and enterprises are composed of subsystems that have different need priorities and can be handled by different estimation and performance approaches. Real-time, safety-critical control systems and security kernels need high assurance, but are relatively stable. GUIs need rapid adaptability to change, but with GUI-builder systems, can largely compensate for lower assurance levels via rapid fixes. A key point here is that for most enterprises and large systems, there is no one-size-fits-all method of sizing, estimating, and performing.

This implies a need for guidance on what kind of process to use for what kind of system or subsystem, and on what kinds of sizing and estimation capabilities fit what kinds of processes. A start toward such guidance is provided in Table 2 [30].

Table 2 summarizes the traditional single-step waterfall process plus several forms of incremental development, each of which meets different competitive challenges and which are best served by different cost estimation approaches.

The time phasing of each form is expressed in terms of the increment 1, 2, 3, ... content with respect to the Rational Unified Process (RUP) phases of Inception, Elaboration, Construction, and Transition (IECT) in Figure 3.

The profiles in Figure 3 are representative cost model outputs for these phases. They show estimated staffing levels over time using the COCOMO II default effort and schedule phase distributions for RUP [2]. Not only does an estimation model have to calculate effort and schedule per phase per iteration, but in the incremental processes there are cross-increment work dependencies to account for.

The Single Step model is the traditional waterfall model, in which the requirements are pre-specified, and the system is developed to the requirements in a single increment. Single-increment parametric estimation models, complemented by expert judgment, are best for this process.

The Prespecified Sequential incremental development model is not evolutionary. It just splits up the development in order to field an early Initial Operational Capability, followed by several pre-planned product Improvements (P3Is). When requirements are prespecifiable and stable, it enables a strong, predictable process. When requirements are emergent and/or rapidly changing, it often requires very expensive rework when it needs to undo architectural commitments. Cost estimation can be performed by sequential application of single-step parametric models plus the use of an IDPD factor, or by parametric model extensions supporting the estimation of increments, including options for increment overlap and breakage of existing increments, such as the COINCOMO extension of COCOMO II.

The Evolutionary Sequential model rapidly develops an initial operational capability and upgrades it based on operational experience. Pure agile software development fits this model: if something is wrong, it will be fixed in 30 days in the next release. Rapid fielding also fits this model for larger or hardware-software systems. Its strength is getting

quick-response capabilities in the field. For pure agile, it can fall prey to an easiest-first set of architectural commitments which break when, for example, it tries to add security or scalability as a new feature in a later increment. For rapid fielding, it may be expensive to keep the development team together while waiting for usage feedback, but it may be worth it. For small agile projects, group consensus techniques such as Planning Poker are best; for larger projects, parametric models with an IDPD factor are best.




Figure 3. Lifecycle Process Phasing for Cost Estimation

Evolutionary Overlapped covers the special case of deferring the next increment until critical enablers such as desired new technology, anticipated new commercial product capabilities, or needed funding become available or mature enough to be added.

Evolutionary Concurrent has the systems engineers handling the change traffic and rebaselining the plans and specifications for the next increment, while keeping the development stabilized for the current increment.

All Cost Estimation approaches also include an expert-judgment cross-check.

IX. ADDITIONAL FUTURE CHALLENGES FROM ISERN  
2010 PANEL

A panel session at ISERN 2010 on future challenges for software measurement and empirical methods yielded complementary perspectives. It included panelists from four continents: Ross Jeffery from Australia, Jurgen Munch from Germany, Forrest Shull from the USA, and Qing Wang from

China, plus a number of additional insights from session participants.

Ross Jeffery emphasized the need for better matches to emerging methods (agile, lean) and application approaches (mobile, COTS-intensive, cloud/services-intensive, internets of things such as automobiles or automated highways), and the need to relate measurements to various objectives (schedule, cost, quality, adaptability, business value).

TABLE II. SITUATION-DEPENDENT PROCESSES AND ESTIMATION APPROACHES

Type	Examples	Pros	Cons	Cost Estimation
Single Step	Stable; High Assurance	Pre-specifiable full-capability requirements	Emergent requirements or rapid change	Single-increment parametric estimation models
Pre-specified Sequential	Platform base plus PPIs	Pre-specifiable full-capability requirements	Emergent requirements or rapid change	COINCOMO or repeated single-increment parametric model estimation with IDPD
Evolutionary Sequential	Small: Agile Large: Evolutionary Development	Adaptability to change	Easiest-first; late, costly breakage	Small: Planning poker-type Large: Parametric with IDPD and Requirements Volatility
Evolutionary Overlapped	COTS-intensive systems	Immaturity risk avoidance	Delay may be non competitive	Parametric with IDPD and Requirements Volatility
Evolutionary Concurrent	Mainstream product lines; Systems of systems	High assurance with rapid change	Highly coupled systems with very rapid change	COINCOMO with IDPD for development; COSYSMO for rebaselining

Jurgen Munch similarly emphasized challenges due to changes in the objects measured (cloud services, self-organizing teams); changes in qualities measured (cloud services volatility and scalability, effects of environment changes on -ilities (mobile device power consumption); changes in goal priorities and relations to GQM (rapid development and adaptation; business value); and life cycle perspectives (total cost of ownership vs. development cost; return-on-investment).

Forrest Shull emphasized the challenges of harnessing emerging data mining technology to produce much more non-intrusive, higher-value software measurement and analysis results via relations to business/mission value chains and quality attributes. He also raised questions about the evolving software workforce (multitasking skills, lower attention spans, use of applications mashups) and their implications on what and how to measure.

Qing Wang presented results of recent surveys of Chinese software organizations and their implicit challenges: low (15-28%) use of cost models due to difficulties and expense of calibration data collection and analysis; inaccurate estimates due to unclear and volatile requirements (top two of over 15 causes). She also emphasized challenges due to increasing management pressure for quick results while being vague about the requirements; total cost of ownership estimation, including hardware and legacy system adaptation; and the need for education and training of data suppliers.

The session participants also contributed insights on future challenges, such as better integration of software, hardware, and business management measurement and analysis; the need to account for domain variabilities in

inputs (sizing, cost drivers) and outputs (productivity metrics, business value) across the enterprise; avoiding easy-to-game measurements and calibrating data contributors; measuring value-attributes such as the degree of innovation and competitive advantage; and tailorable multi-attribute measurement frameworks such as balanced scorecards.

Overall, the biggest challenge appears to be the dynamism of the overall software field (the next wave of innovations after cloud computing, social networks, mobile devices, net-centric systems of systems, powerful data searching and mining), and the need for software metrics and estimation capabilities to keep up with them.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Nguyen, "Improved Size and Effort Estimation Models for Software Maintenance," PhD Dissertation, Department of Computer Science, University of Southern California, December 2010, [http://csse.usc.edu/csse/TECHRPTS/by\\_author.html#Nguyen](http://csse.usc.edu/csse/TECHRPTS/by_author.html#Nguyen)
- [2] B. Boehm, C. Abts, W. Brown, S. Chulani, B. Clark, E. Horowitz, R. Madachy, D. Reifer, and B. Steece, *Software Cost Estimation with COCOMO II*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2000.
- [3] T. Tan, Q. Li, B. Boehm, Y. Yang, M. He, and R. Moazeni, "Productivity Trends in Incremental and Iterative Software Development," *Proceedings, ACM-IEEE ESEM 2009*.
- [4] G. Gill, and M. Iansiti, "Microsoft Corporation: Office Business Unit," Harvard Business School Case Study 691-033, 1994.
- [5] A. Elssamadisy, and G. Schalliol, "Recognizing and Responding to 'Bad Smells' in Extreme Programming", *Proceedings, ICSE 2002*, pp. 617-622.
- [6] *Systems Engineering Guide for System of Systems*, Version 1.0, OUSD(AT&L), June 2008.
- [7] R. Valerdi, *The Constructive Systems Engineering Cost Model (COSYSMO)*, VDM Verlag, 2008.



- [8] J. Lane, "Cost Model Extensions to Support Systems Engineering Cost Estimation for Complex Systems and Systems of Systems," 7th Annual Conference on Systems Engineering Research 2009 (CSER 2009)
- [9] J. Lane, and B. Boehm, "Modern Tools to Support DoD Software Intensive System of Systems Cost Estimation - A DACS State-of-the-Art Report," August 2007.
- [10] Y. Yang, J. Bhuta, B. Boehm, and D. Port, "Value-Based Processes for COTS-Based Applications," IEEE Software, Volume 22, Issue 4, July-August 2005, pp. 54-62.
- [11] S. Koolmanojwong, and B. Boehm, "The Incremental Commitment Model Process Patterns for Rapid-Fielding Projects," Proceedings, ICSP 2010, Paderborn, Germany.
- [12] B. Boehm and V. Basili, "Software Defect Reduction Top 10 List," IEEE Computer, vol. 34(1): 135-137, January 2001.
- [13] D. Galorath, and M. Evans, Software Sizing, Estimation, and Risk Management, Auerbach Publications, 2006.
- [14] C. Abts, "Extending the COCOMO II Software Cost Model to Estimate Effort and Schedule for Software Systems Using Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) Software Components: The COCOTS Model," PhD Dissertation, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Southern California, May 2004.
- [15] M. Bisignani, and T. Reed, "Software Security Costing Issues", COCOMO Users' Group Meeting. 1988. Los Angeles: USC Center for Software Engineering.
- [16] D. Reifer, Security: A Rating Concept for COCOMO II. 2002. Reifer Consultants, Inc.
- [17] ISO JTC 1/SC 27, Evaluation Criteria for IT Security, in Part 1: Introduction and general model, International Organization for Standardization (ISO), 1999.
- [18] E. Colbert, and B. Boehm, "Cost Estimation for Secure Software & Systems," ISPA / SCEA 2008 Joint International Conference, June 2008.
- [19] H. Price, and J. Morley, "Create, Apply, and Amplify: A Story of Technology Development," SEI Monitor, February 2009, page 2.
- [20] R. Hopkins, and K. Jenkins, Eating the IT Elephant: Moving from Greenfield Development to Brownfield, IBM Press.
- [21] G. Lewis, et al., "SMART: Analyzing the Reuse Potential of Legacy Components on a Service-Oriented Architecture Environment," CMU/SEI-2008-TN-008.
- [22] B. Boehm, "Applying the Incremental Commitment Model to Brownfield System Development," Proceedings, CSER 2009.
- [23] R. Stutzke, Estimating Software-Intensive Systems, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Addison Wesley, 2005.
- [24] M. Broy, "Seamless Method- and Model-based Software and Systems Engineering," The Future of Software Engineering, Springer, 2010.
- [25] D. Anderson, Kanban, Blue Hole Press, 2010.
- [26] M. Cohn, Agile Estimating and Planning, Prentice Hall, 2005.
- [27] B. Boehm, Software Engineering Economics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1981.
- [28] K. Lee, and B. Boehm, "Empirical Results from an Experiment on Value-Based Review (VBR) Processes," Proceedings, ISESE 2005, September 2005.
- [29] Q. Li, M. Li, Y. Yang, Q. Wang, T. Tan, B. Boehm and C. Hu, "Bridge the Gap between Software Test Process and Business Value: A Case Study". Proceedings, ICSP 2009.
- [30] B. Boehm, and J. Lane, "'DoD Systems Engineering and Management Implications for Evolutionary Acquisition of Major Defense Systems," Proceedings, CSER 2010.