Bottom Up Methods of Estimating Software SEPM and Non-DCTI Cost

2017 ICEAA Professional Development & Training Workshop

James R. Black June 2017 Bio

- Presenter: James "Jay" Black has 13 years of cost estimating experience
 - Currently works as a software project manager for the Administration for Children and Families within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 - In this role, he supports the Grant Solutions software suite used to administer 1200 grant programs in eight Federal departments
 - Jay has a Masters in Systems Engineering from Johns Hopkins
 University and holds a current CCE/A certification
- Jay worked for the Navy cost community (NAVAIR 4.2, NCCA, & NAVSEA 05C) from 2003 through 2015
- For questions, comments, and/or feedback please email me at:
 - James.robert.black@gmail.com
 - James.black@acf.hhs.gov

If any material in this brief is of use to you now or later, please email me, I'd love to know

References & Abstract

- References/Acknowledgements:
 - Mike Popp's observations on IEEE Standard 11207
 - Tim Lawless observations on Systems Engineering/Program Management
 - Cost Estimating Body of Knowledge (CEBoK) Module 1 Cost Estimating Basics
- Presentation abstract:
 - Systems Engineering/Program Management (SE/PM) and additional non-Design, Code, Test, and Integration (Non-DCTI) activities performed during software development efforts are often significant and drive estimates of total project costs
 - Yet, cost estimates often omit the detailed research and analysis needed to adequately model SE/PM & Non-DCTI costs
 - This brief will present bottom up methods useful for understanding and estimating these costs and share analysis of recent SE/PM & Non-DCTI data

This presentation is the result of practicing detailed actual cost data collection for a variety of platform and system estimates/analyses

www.iceaaonline.com/portland2017

Bottom Line Up Front (BLUF)

- The WBS is the foundation and a common WBS speeds the uptake of information for the cost estimate's audience
- Be diligent in identifying how effort is allocated to DCTI, Non-DCTI and/or SEPM: take care not to double count or omit effort
- IEEE 12207 is useful when differentiating between SEPM & DCTI
- Because SEPM is a predominately fixed & recurring cost, estimating it best served by a bottom up methodology
- Factor driven estimating methodologies are useful in the absence of time/data and can be useful crosschecks

WBS = Work Breakdown Structure DCTI = Design, Code, Test, & Integration SEPM = Systems Engineering & Program Management IEEE = Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

WBS is the Foundation

Per Cost Estimating Body of Knowledge (CEBoK) Module 1 Cost Est. Basics:

- A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) establishes a common frame of reference for relating job tasks to each other and relating project costs at the summary level of detail
 - It provides a consistent and visible framework for specifying the objectives, labor, materials, and contracts of the system/program.
 - The structure is used to define the total program/system by providing detailed definitions of individual elements required (via a WBS Dictionary)
- A WBS should be tailored for each system or program for the purpose of capturing all the idiosyncrasies endemic to each system/program
- Estimate uses a WBS that is at a level of detail appropriate to ensure that cost elements are neither omitted nor double-counted
- Estimate is presented in a WBS fully traceable to the system specification
- WBS structure is aligned to organizational structure performing the work; WBS element tasks are traceable to data, which is traceable back to the respective source documents

The WBS is the foundation and a common WBS speeds the uptake of information for the cost estimate's audience

www.iceaaonline.com/portland2017

WBS Example - MIL-STD-881C

- For Department of Defense projects, WBS templates are provided in: MIL-STD-881C Work Breakdown Structures for Defense Material Items
- An example WBS from MIL-STD-881C for an Automated Information System follows:
 - 1.0 Automated Information System (AIS)

| 1.1 AIS Prime Mission Product (PMP) Relea 1.1.1 Custom Application Software 1 1.1.2 Enterprise Service Element 1n 1.1.3 Enterprise Information System 1 1.1.4 External System Interface Develo 1.1.5 AIS Platform Hardware 1.1.6 System Level Integration* | ase/Increment X Design, Code, Test, & Integration (DCTI) Element-level software development Non-recurring, variable costs: driven by a software sizing measure, e.g. Source Lines of Code (SLOC) |
|--|---|
| 1.2 System Engineering 1.3 Program Management 1.4 Change Management 1.5 System Test and Evaluation 1.6 Training 1.7 Data 1.8 Peculiar Support Equipment 1.9 Common Support Equipment | "SE/PM" or "SEPM" System-level activities related to software, hardware, and integration Recurring, fixed costs: driven by a Level-of- Effort headcount mostly independent of software size |
| 1.10 Operational/Site Activation 1.11 Industrial Facilities 1.12 Initial Spares and Repair Parts * Note: 1.2 & 1.3 also include system level integration efforts | So, what does it mean when estimators refer to "Non-DCTI"? ⁶ |

Software Cost Estimating Key Words

- Design, Code, Test, & Integration (DCTI)
- Systems Engineering & Program Management (SEPM)
- "Non-DCTI" In the presenter's experience, Non-DCTI is the SEPM related to software development
 - Exists as a recurring development activity
 - Often begins before the start of non-recurring development activities (i.e. DCTI)
 - Continues throughout the execution of DCTI activities
 - Keep in mind: since Non-DCTI is not immediately identifiable in MIL-STD-881C, it can mean different things to different people

Be diligent in identifying how effort is allocated to DCTI, Non-DCTI and/or SEPM: take care not to double count or omit effort

Presented at the 2017 ICEAA Professional Development & Theining Workshop and 1220 www.iceaaonline.com/portland2017

"Systems and Software Engineering - Software Life Cycle Processes"



SEPM Estimating

- When estimating SEPM:
 - For continued development on an existing system (e.g. future spiral or increment): collect SEPM FTE actuals from prior spirals/increments (e.g. from CCDRs 1921 & 1921-1)
 - For a new system: collect SEPM FTE actuals for analogous systems (e.g. from CCDRs 1921 & 1921-1)
 - Normalize collected data:
 - Identify how representative prior FTEs are of future effort required
 - Parse total FTEs to identify software efforts
- To estimate SEPM costs:
 - First, use a bottom up estimating methodology: FTEs/year * Years of development * Labor Rate
 - Then, use a crosscheck: DCTI cost or hours * Non-DCTI factor

Primary estimating approach: bottom up methodology Crosscheck: factor driven approach

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent CCDR = Contractor Cost Data Reportina

9

SEPM as a Fixed Cost

- Why not use a parametric technique to estimate SEPM?
 - I.e.: why not use Excel's "Analysis ToolPak" or ACEIT Costat to develop a correlation between SEPM Hours (or cost) and an objective measure (ESLOC, DSLOC, weight, volume, etc.)?
- SEPM is a predominately fixed and recurring cost:
 - SEPM does not scale directly with the project's objective measures
 - E.g.: for every additional ESLOC of a project, there is not a proportional increase in the number of SEPM FTEs
 - SEPM often varies significantly depending on the project/contractor/vendor
- However, SEPM *does scale* with the total number of concurrent baselines under development:
 - E.g.: if the system under development will be integrated onto 2 different host aircraft types; then, the total SEPM costs will be greater than if the system was integrated onto 1 host aircraft type
 - I.e.: costs for integrating a system onto 2 platforms > 1 platform

Because SEPM is a predominately fixed & recurring cost, estimating it best served by a bottom up methodology

10

Collecting SEPM Actuals by Labor Category

- When collecting SEPM FTE actuals from a contractor/vendor:
 - Separately identify FTEs by constituent labor categories
 - Parse FTEs by effort split between SEPM and DCTI
 - E.g. a small software development effort could be:

| | FT | FTEs | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------|--|--|
| Labor Category | SEPM | DCTI | | |
| Project Manager | 1 | | | |
| System Architect | 0.5 | | | |
| Business Architect | 0.5 | | | |
| Software Development Lead | 0.25 | 1 | | |
| Business Specialist | 1 | | | |
| Security Specialist | curity Specialist 0.25 | | | |
| Business Analyst | 1 | 1 | | |
| Database Administrator | | 1.5 | | |
| Software Developer | | 8 | | |
| Quality Assurance Lead | 0.5 | 0.5 | | |
| Test Engineer | | 2 | | |
| Technical Writer | 1 | | | |
| Total | 6 | 14 | | |



Presented at the Schaffet Walfree To Development Construction/portland2017 Rosetta Stone

Software Development Cost = Variable Costs + Fixed Costs



Slide POC: james.robert.black@qmail.com

Presented at the 2017 ICEAA Profession Robert Company range of the Profession Robert Company ran

When Estimating Software Costs

- Get as much *visibility* as possible when collecting SEPM FTE actuals from contractors/vendors:
 - Use IEEE 12207 to forge a common understanding of SEPM and DCTI
 - Separately identify recurring and non-recurring FTEs
 - Separately identify FTEs performing software, hardware, and integration related activities
 - Identify FTEs by constituent labor categories (i.e. how many project) managers, systems architects, business analysts, domain specialists or subject matter experts, etc.)
 - If there are multiple concurrent spirals/increments or baselines, identify how the total SEPM is split between them
- *Partition* a software cost estimate into two components:
 - Variable, non-recurring costs DCTI, i.e. costs dependent on software size
 - Fixed, recurring costs Software SEPM or Non-DCTI, i.e. costs independent of software size

Visibility & Partitioning are useful when comparing cost estimates and briefing results to senior leaders

Summary

- The WBS is the foundation and a common WBS speeds the uptake of information for the cost estimate's audience
- Be diligent in identifying how effort is allocated to DCTI, Non-DCTI and/or SEPM: take care not to double count or omit effort
- IEEE 12207 is useful when differentiating between SEPM & DCTI
- Because SEPM is a predominately fixed & recurring cost, estimating it best served by a bottom up methodology
- Factor driven estimating methodologies are useful in the absence of time/data and can be useful crosschecks

• Q&A

• Backup

Presented at the 2017 ICEAA Professional Development & Training Workshop www.iceaaonline.com/portland2017 SEPM Scaling with # of Platforms

- SEPM *does scale* with the total number of concurrent baselines under development:
 - E.g.: if the system under development will be integrated onto *2 different* host platform types; then, the total SEPM costs will be greater than if the system was integrated onto 1 host platform type
 - I.e.: costs for integrating a system onto 2 platforms > 1 platform

Example where a second host platform is added in Year 4 of development:



SEPM is a predominately fixed cost, but does scale with the # of platform types

Presented at the 2017 ICEAA refessional Development's Tlaining Workshop and 1220 "Systems and Software Engineering - Software Life

Cycle Processes"

| | CEDN | | 5.3 The Development Process | | | | | |
|----|--------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | JLFIVI | 1 | | Activity | Tasks (paraphrased) | 12207.1 Inform | ation Item guidelines | |
| | System-lovel | | | 5.3.1 Process | .1 Define software life cycle model | | | |
| ٦. | System-level | | | Implementation | .2 Document and control outputs | | | |
| | activities related | | | | 4 Document development plans | Plan Desc | 6.5 DPP 6.17 SDSD | |
| Т | | | | | .5 Deliver all needed products | | | |
| Т | to software, | | | 5.3.2 System | .1 Specify system requirements | Specification | 6.26 SRS | |
| L | hardwara and | | | requirements | .2 Evaluate requirements against criteria | Spec, Record | 6.26 SRS, 6.6 SRER | |
| L | naruware, anu | | | 5 3 3 System | 1 Establish ton-level architecture | Description | 6 25 SARAD | |
| L | integration | | | architectural | .2 Evaluate architecture against criteria | Desc. Record | 6.25 SARAD. 6.6 SAER | |
| L | integration | | | design | | | | |
| | | - | | 5.3.4 Software | 1 Document software requirements | Desc | 6.22 SRD, 6.30 UDD | |
| | | | | requirements | .2 Evaluate requirements against criteria | Desc, Record | 6.22 SRD, 6.6 SRER | |
| | | | | 5 3 5 Software | 1 Transform requirements into architecture | Description | 6 12 SAD | |
| | | | | architectural | .2 Document top-level design for interfaces | Description | 6.19 SIDD | |
| | | | | design | .3 Document top-level design for database | Description | 6.4 DBDD | |
| | | | | | .4 Document preliminary user documentation | Description | 6.30 UDD | |
| | | | | | 6 Evaluate architecture against criteria | Plan Desc Record | 6.12 SAD 6.6 SAFR | |
| | | | | | .7 Conduct joint reviews iaw 6.6 | | | |
| | | | | 5.3.6 Software | .1 Document design for each component | Description | 6.16 SDD | |
| | | | | detailed design | .2 Document design for interfaces | Description | 6.19 SIDD | |
| | | | | | 4 Undate user documentation | Description | 6.4 DBDD 6.30 UDD | |
| | | | | | .5 Document unit test requirements | Plan | 6.27T/VP | |
| | DCTI | | | | .6 Update integration test requirements | Plan | 6.27T/VP | |
| | | | | | .7 Evaluate detailed design against criteria | Rec, Desc | 6.6 DDER, 6.16 SDD | |
| | Element-level | | | 5.3.7 Software | 1 Document each unit database and tests | Desc. Rec. Proc | 6 4 DBDD 6 24 SCR 6 28 T//Pr | |
| | | | | coding and | .2 Conduct and document unit testing | Report | 6.29 T/VRR | |
| | software | | | testing | .3 Update user documentation | Description | 6.30 UDD | |
| | development | | | | .4 Update integration test requirements | Plan Rec Plan | 6.27T/VP | |
| | development | | | 5.3.8 Software | 1 Document integration plans | Plan Proc | 6.18 SIP 6.28 T/\/Pr | |
| | | ' I | | integration | .2 Conduct and document integration tests | Report | 6.29 T/VRR | |
| | | | | - | .3 Update user documentation | Description | 6.30 UDD | |
| | | | | | .4 Document qualification tests | Proc Doco | 6.28 T/VPr | |
| | | | | | .6 conduct joint reviews jaw 6.6 | Record, Plan | 6.6 SIER. 6.18 SIP | |
| | | | | 5.3.9 Software | .1 Conduct and document qualification testing | Report | 6.29 T/VRR | |
| | | | | qualification | .2 Update user documentation | Description | 6.30 UDD | |
| Г | | n I | | testing | .3 Evaluate tests against criteria | Record | 6.6 SIER | |
| L | CEDN/ | | | | 5 Prepare product for next phase | Record | 6 24 SCR | |
| | JEFIVI | | | 5.3.10 System | .1 Integrate software with hardware & others | Report | 6.29 T/VRR | |
| L | System-level | | | integration | .2 Document integration tests | Procedure | 6.28 T/VPr | |
| 1 | System-level | | | 5 2 11 System | .3 Evaluate integrated system against criteria | Record | 6.6 SQIER 6.20 TA/PP | |
| | activities related | | | gualification | .2 Evaluate system against criteria | Record | 6.6 SER | |
| | | | | testing | .3 Support audits iaw 6.7 | | | |
| | to software, | | | | .4 Prepare product for installation | Record | 6.24 SCR | |
| | hardware and | | | 5.3.12 Software | .1 Plan installation in target environment | | | |
| 1 | naiuwale, aliu | | | 5 3 13 Software | .∠ Install soltware law plan 1 Support acquirer's acceptance tests | Report | 6 29 T//RB | |
| 1 | integration | | | acceptance | .2 Deliver product per contract | Record | 6.24 SCR | |
| L | | | | support | 3 Provide training per contract | | | |