### 1.264 Lecture 4

## Time and resource estimation, part 2

Next class: Read CMMI papers. Hand in case studies by noon before class

## Schedule estimation from tables

- Shortest possible schedule. (You can't beat this.)
- Talent from top 10\%, years of experience in environment
- Ideal management, all staff available day 1
- Requirements known day 1 and don't change
- Tools, offices, methods are ideal
- Efficient schedule.
- Talent from top 25\%, low turnover
- Competent management, staff available as needed
- Requirements changes are minor (5\%); tools, offices are effective
- Nominal schedule
- Talent from top 50\%, turnover 12\% per year
- Some familiarity with tools and environment


## Schedule estimation from tables

| Shortest Possible Schedules |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Systems | s Products | Busines | ss Products | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shrink } \\ & \text { Proc } \end{aligned}$ | -Wrap ducts |
| System Size <br> (lines of code) | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) |
| 10,000 | 6 | 25 | 3.5 | 5 | 4.2 | 8 |
| 15,000 | 7 | 40 | 4.1 | 8 | 4.9 | 13 |
| 20,000 | 8 | 57 | 4.6 | 11 | 5.6 | 19 |
| 25,000 | 9 | 74 | 5.1 | 15 | 6 | 24 |
| 30,000 | 9 | 110 | 5.5 | 22 | 7 | 37 |
| 35,000 | 10 | 130 | 5.8 | 26 | 7 | 44 |
| 40,000 | 11 | 170 | 6 | 34 | 7 | 57 |
| 45,000 | 11 | 195 | 6 | 39 | 8 | 66 |
| 50,000 | 11 | 230 | 7 | 46 | 8 | 79 |
| 60,000 | 12 | 285 | 7 | 57 | 9 | 98 |
| 70,000 | 13 | 350 | 8 | 71 | 9 | 120 |
| 80,000 | 14 | 410 | 8 | 83 | 10 | 140 |
| 90,000 | 14 | 480 | 9 | 96 | 10 | 170 |
| 100,000 | 15 | 540 | 9 | 110 | 11 | 190 |
| 120,000 | 16 | 680 | 10 | 140 | 11 | 240 |
| 140,000 | 17 | 820 | 10 | 160 | 12 | 280 |
| 160,000 | 18 | 960 | 10 | 190 | 13 | 335 |
| 180,000 | 19 | 1,100 | 11 | 220 | 13 | 390 |
| 200,000 | 20 | 1,250 | 11 | 250 | 14 | 440 |
| 250,000 | 22 | 1,650 | 13 | 330 | 15 | 580 |
| 300,000 | 24 | 2,100 | 14 | 420 | 16 | 725 |
| 400,000 | 27 | 2,900 | 15 | 590 | 19 | 1,000 |
| 500,000 | 30 | 3,900 | 17 | 780 | 20 | 1,400 |
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## Schedule estimation from tables

Efficient Schedules

|  | Systems Products |  | Business Products |  | Shrink-Wrap Products |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| System Size (lines of code) | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) |
| 10,000 | 8 | 24 | 4.9 | 5 | 5.9 | 8 |
| 15,000 | 10 | 38 | 5.8 | 8 | 7 | 12 |
| 20,000 | 11 | 54 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 18 |
| 25,000 | 12 | 70 | 7 | 14 | 9 | 23 |
| 30,000 | 13 | 97 | 8 | 20 | 9 | 32 |
| 35,000 | 14 | 120 | 8 | 24 | 10 | 39 |
| 40,000 | 15 | 140 | 9 | 30 | 10 | 49 |
| 45,000 | 16 | 170 | 9 | 34 | 11 | 57 |
| 50,000 | 16 | 190 | 10 | 40 | 11 | 67 |
| 60,000 | 18 | 240 | 10 | 49 | 12 | 83 |
| 70,000 | 19 | 290 | 11 | 61 | 13 | 100 |
| 80,000 | 20 | 345 | 12 | 71 | 14 | 120 |
| 90,000 | 21 | 400 | 12 | 82 | 15 | 140 |
| 100,000 | 22 | 450 | 13 | 93 | 15 | 160 |
| 120,000 | 23 | 560 | 14 | 115 | 16 | 195 |
| 140,000 | 25 | 670 | 15 | 140 | 17 | 235 |
| 160,000 | 26 | 709 | 15 | 160 | 18 | 280 |
| 180,000 | 28 | 910 | 16 | 190 | 19 | 320 |
| 200,000 | 29 | 1,300 | 17 | 210 | 20 | 360 |
| 250,000 | 32 | 1,300 | 19 | 280 | 22 | 470 |
| 300,000 | 34 | 1,650 | 20 | 345 | 24 | 590 |
| 400,000 | 38 | 2,350 | 22 | 490 | 27 | 830 |
| 500,000 | 42 | 3,100 | 25 | 640 | 29 | 1,100 |
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## Schedule estimation from tables

| Nominal Schedules |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Systems Products |  | Business Products |  | Shrink-Wrap Products |  |
| System Size (lines of code) | Schedule (months) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effort } \\ \text { (man-months) } \end{gathered}$ | Schedule (months) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effort } \\ \text { (man-months) } \end{gathered}$ | Schedule (months) | Effort (man-months) |
| 10,000 | 10 | 48 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 15 |
| 15,000 | 12 | 76 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 24 |
| 20,000 | 14 | 110 | 8 | 21 | 9 | 34 |
| 25,000 | 15 | 140 | 9 | 27 | 10 | 44 |
| 30,000 | 16 | 185 | 9 | 37 | 11 | 59 |
| 35,000 | 17 | 220 | 10 | 44 | 12 | 71 |
| 40,000 | 18 | 270 | 10 | 54 | 13 | 88 |
| 45,000 | 19 | 310 | 11 | 61 | 13 | 100 |
| 50,000 | 20 | 360 | 11 | 71 | 14 | 115 |
| 60,000 | 21 | 440 | 12 | 88 | 15 | 145 |
| 70,000 | 23 | 540 | 13 | 105 | 16 | 175 |
| 80,000 | 24 | 630 | 14 | 125 | 17 | 210 |
| 90,000 | 25 | 730 | 15 | 140 | 17 | 240 |
| 100,000 | 26 | 820 | 15 | 160 | 18 | 270 |
| 120,000 | 28 | 1,000 | 16 | 200 | 20 | 335 |
| 140,000 | 30 | 1,200 | 17 | 240 | 21 | 400 |
| 160,000 | 32 | 1,400 | 18 | 280 | 22 | 470 |
| 180,000 | 34 | 1,600 | 19 | 330 | 23 | 540 |
| 200,000 | 35 | 1,900 | 20 | 370 | 24 | 610 |
| 250,000 | 38 | 2,400 | 22 | 480 | 26 | 800 |
| 300,000 | 41 | 3,000 | 24 | 600 | 29 | 1,000 |
| 400,000 | 47 | 4,200 | 27 | 840 | 32 | 1,400 |
| 500,000 | 51 | 5,500 | 29 | 1,100 | 35 | 1,800 |
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## Questions

- How long would it take to write a 30,000 line systems product with the three different approaches (fastest, efficient, nominal)?
- How large would the team be in each case?
- Explain the differences
- How long would it take to write 50,000 line systems, business and shrink-wrap products with a nominal approach?
- How large would the team be in each case?
- Explain the differences
- Graph calendar months, person months versus lines of code for a systems product, any approach
- Describe whether it's linear or nonlinear
- Just graph a few points; you don't need all of them
- If nonlinear, in what way? Economies or diseconomies of scale?
- You don't need to apply ranges in this exercise


## Answers

- 30,000 line systems product with the three different approaches?
- 9 months fastest possible
- 13 months efficient
- 16 months nominal
- How large would the team be in each case?
- 12 people fastest possible
- 7-8 people efficient
- 11-12 people nominal
- Explain the differences
- Staff quality, process maturity (people, process)
- 50,000 line product with nominal approach
- 20 months system, 11 months business, 14 months shrink-wrap
- Team size
- 18 system, 6.5 business, 8 shrink-wrap
- Explain the differences
- Systems software requires much more design, care in implementation, testing, and will have many more bugs
- Shrink wrap software must be more general and more easily configured and supported than business software
- Graphs: Nonlinear. Resources (person months) have diseconomies of scale. Schedule time growth less than linear. Team size grows very quickly.


## Estimate refinement

## Example of Single-Point-Estimation

 History| Point in Project | Estimate <br> (man- months) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Initial product concept | 100 |
| Approved product concept | 100 |
| Requirements specification | 135 |
| Product design specification | 145 |
| Detailed design specification | 160 |
| Final | 170 |
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| Example of a Range-Estimation <br> History |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Point in Project Estimate <br> (man- months) <br> Initial product concept $25-400$ <br> Approved product concept $50-200$ <br> Requirements specification $90-200$ <br> Product design specification $120-180$ <br> Detailed design specification $145-180$ <br> Final 170 |  |

## Scheduling problems

- Developers/analysts/consultants underestimate task durations by 20-30\% on average
- And omit 30-50\% of tasks
- Average small project estimate is off by $100 \%$
- Big projects are worse
- Once deadlines are missed, more effort is spent explaining and re-planning
- Schedule pressures affect morale, quality
- 40\% of software errors are due to schedule pressure
- Gambling in technical approach often occurs
- This occurs in non-software projects as well


## Scheduling pressures

- Causes
- Wishful thinking by customers, managers
- No awareness of software estimation methods
- Poor negotiating skills
- 75\% of developers are introverts, only 33\% of population is
- Marketers, managers tend to be 10 years older and negotiate for a living
- Developers oppose negotiating tricks (high initial estimates, etc.)
- Cures
- Principled negotiation
- Separate people from positions (cooperate, explore options)
- Focus on interests, not positions (find underlying needs)
- Find mutual gains (phasing, fewer features, add resources)
- Insist on using objective criteria (don't negotiate the estimate itself)


## Scheduling: Feature set control

- Early project: feature set reduction
- Minimal spec
- Requirements scrubbing
- Versioned development
- Mid-project: feature creep control
- Change analysis, change control board
- Versioned development
- Short development cycles
- Late project: feature cuts
- Eliminate low priority features
- Remember:
- A 50\% cut in project size yields a 75\% reduction in resources and about a $50 \%$ reduction in schedule


## Scheduling: Recovery

- Most projects are in recovery mode much of the time
- Primary problem is not how to finish quickly, but how to finish at all
- Options
- Cut software/project size
- Increase productivity with short-term improvements
- Slip the schedule
- Recovery plan
- People: improve morale, correct major personnel and major leadership problems
- Adding people to a late project only makes it later
- Process: fix classic errors, miniature milestones, risk mgt
- Product: stabilize requirements, cut features, fix bugs


## Summary: resource estimation

- Almost always use spiral/agile model: Multiples of:
- Requirements, design, implementation, QA
- Use requirements and design documents to estimate resources using function points
- Requirements define product scope
- Choose technology, determine lines of code
- Estimate schedule, personnel
- System type (systems, business, shrink wrap)
- Process type (fastest, efficient, nominal, other)
- Apply convergence graph to all estimates
- Adjust as things change
- Spirals, negotiation, feature management
- Mini milestones, risk mgt, avoid classic mistakes
- This works in non-software projects just as well
- Shortest possible schedule: more expensive
- Bigger project than past: diseconomies, more expensive
- Less talented team than usual: longer, more expensive
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