

# Applying Process Simulation to Achieve High-Value Benefits

David M. Raffo, Ph.D. Quantel, Inc. Software Engineering Institute Portland State University <u>raffod@pdx.edu</u> c) 503-939-1720



# Agenda: Part I

- 1. Introduction: What is Process Simulation?
- 2. Motivation: What can be done with Process Simulation Models?
- 3. Examples of High Value Add Ways the Process Simulation Can be applied within an organization
- 4. Wrap-Up/ Conclusions



## What Is a Simulation Model?

- A simulation model is a computerized model (not a maturity model) designed to display significant features of the dynamic system it represents.
- Simulations are generally employed when
  - behavior over time is of particular interest or significance, and
  - the economics or logistics of manipulating the system being modeled are prohibitive
- □ Common purposes of simulation models are:
  - to provide a basis for experimentation,
  - to predict behavior,
  - to answer "what if" questions,
  - to teach about the system being modeled.



# What is Process Simulation?

- Process simulation models focus on the dynamics of systems development, maintenance and acquisition projects
- They represent the process
  - as currently implemented (as-is, as-practiced, asdocumented), or
  - as planned for future implementation (to-be)
- □ Simulation Features
  - Use Graphical interfaces
  - Utilizes actual data/ metrics
  - Predict performance
  - Supports "What if" Analyses
  - Support business case analyses
  - Reduces risk



## Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance, V&V and IV&V Strategy for a project
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and make better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities
- Architect, Design, and Document Processes
- Estimate Project Costs from the Bottom Up
- Manage Projects Quantitatively
- Train Project Managers



#### Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance, V&V, and IV&V Strategy for a project
  - Globally Distributed SW Development



# NASA Model – IEEE 12207 Software Development Lifecycle





#### IV&V Layer – Select Criticality Levels for IV&V Techniques using pull-down menus

#### Notebook - IEEE12207\_Baseline.mox

IV&V Profile: Silap-Unmanned

Save IV&V Profile

Load IV&V Profile: Delete IV&V Profile:

|     |   | Concept     | Verification    | Requiremen  | ts Verification | Design Ve   | erification     | Code Ve     | erification     | Valida      | ation           |
|-----|---|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| ID  | IV&V Technique  | Consequence | Error Potential |
| 1.1 | Management and Planning of<br>Independent Verification and Validation | 1 ,         | 1 🗸             | 1 -         | 1,              | 1 ,         | 1               | 1,          | 1 ,             | 1           | 1 ,             |
| 1.2 | Issue and Risk Tracking   | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 -             |
| 1.3 | Final Report Generation   | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 ,         | 2 ,             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             |
| 1.4 | IV&V Tool Support   | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             |
| 1.5 | Management and Technical Review<br>Support                            | 1,          | 1 ,             | 1,          | 1 📕             | 1,          | 1,              | 1,          | 1 ,             | 1 ,         | 1 ,             |
| 1.6 | Criticality Analysis  | 1 🗸         | 1 🗸             | 1 🗸         | 1 🚽             | 1 .         | 1 🗸             | 1 🗸         | 1 🖵             | 1 🗸         | 1 🗸             |
| 1.7 | Identify Process Improvement<br>Opportunities in the Conduct of IV&V  | 2 ,         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             | 2 ,         | 2 ,             | 2 🗸         | 2 🗸             |
| 2.1 | Reuse Analysis  | 3 🗸         | None 🗸          |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 2.2 | Software Architecture Assessment                                      | 3 🗸         | None 🗸          |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 2.3 | System Requirements Review  | 3 🗸         | 4 🗸             |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 2.4 | Concept Document Evaluation   | None 🗸      | None 🗸          |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 2.5 | Software/User Requirements<br>Allocation Analysis                     | None 🚽      | None 🖵          |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 2.6 | Traceability Analysis   | None 🗸      | None 🗸          |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 3.1 | Traceability Analysis – Requirements                                  |             |                 | 2 🗸         | 4 🗸             |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 3.2 | Software Requirements Evaluation                                      |             |                 | 3 🗸         | 4 🗸             |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| 3.3 | Interface Analysis – Requirements                                     |             |                 | 4 🗸         | 3 🗸             |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |



#### IV&V Layer – Select Criticality Levels for IV&V Techniques using pull-down menus

| A Note           | Notebook - IEEE12207_Baseline.mox                 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |          |
|------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| 2.3              | System Requirements Review                        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 2.4              | Concept Document Evaluation                       | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 2.5              | Software/User Requirements<br>Allocation Analysis | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 2.6              | Traceability Analysis                             | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 3.1              | Traceability Analysis - Requirements              |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        | 2      | 4      | r.       |
| 3.2              | Software Requirements Evaluation                  |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 3.3              | Interface Analysis - Requirements                 |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 3.4              | System test Plan Analysis                         |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        | £        |
| 3.5              | Acceptance Test Plan Analysis                     |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        |          |
| 3.6              | Timing and Sizing Analysis                        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |        |        | 16<br>17 |
| 4.1              | Traceability Analysis - Design                    |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        | 8        |
| 4.2              | Software Design Evaluation                        |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |          |
| 4.3              | Interface Analysis Design                         |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        | 2        |
| 4.4              | Software FQT Plan Analysis                        |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |          |
| 4.5              | Software Integration Test Plan<br>Analysis        |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |        |        |          |
| 4.6              | Database Analysis                                 |        |        |        |        | None - | None 🗸 |        |        |        | 2        |
| 4.7              | Component Test Plan Analysis                      |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None - |        |        |        |          |
| 5.1              | Traceability Analysis - Code                      |        |        |        |        |        |        | None + | None 🗸 |        |          |
| <mark>5.2</mark> | Source Code and Documentation<br>Evaluation       |        |        |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |          |
| 5.3              | Interface Analysis - Code                         |        |        |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸 |        |          |
| 6.1              | Traceability Analysis - Test                      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | None 🗸 | None 🗸   |
| 8.15             | Project Management Oversight<br>Support           | None 🗸 | 1,     | 1,       |



# Impact of IV&V at Different Points in the Development Process

**Result Comparison** 

|      |                      | Total Effort    | <b>Rework Effort</b> | <b>Duration Mean</b> | Corrected Defects   | Latent Defects      |
|------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Case | Configuration        | Mean            | Mean                 |                      | Mean                | Mean                |
|      |                      | (Person Months) | (Person Months)      | (Months)             | (Number of Defects) | (Number of Defects) |
| 1    | Baseline             | 346.26          | 201.65               | 58.42                | 6,038.26            | 629.48              |
| 2    | IV&V at Validation   | 355.35          | 210.75               | 59.95                | 6,113.79            | 574.17              |
| 3    | IV&V at Code         | 334.13          | 189.53               | 57.38                | 6,134.84            | 573.49              |
| 4    | IV&V at Design       | 327.93          | 183.33               | 56.56                | 6,123.11            | 581.27              |
| 5    | IV&V at Requirements | 326.82          | 182.21               | 56.40                | 6,078.87            | 600.04              |

% Improvement Compared to the Baseline

|      |                      | Total Effort | <b>Rework Effort</b> | Duration | Corrected Defects | Latent Defects |
|------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|
| Case | Configuration        | Mean         | Mean                 | Mean     | Mean              | Mean           |
| 1    | Baseline             |              |                      |          |                   |                |
| 2    | IV&V at Validation   | -2.63%*      | -4.51%*              | -2.63%*  | +1.25%            | +8.79%*        |
| 3    | IV&V at Code         | +3.50%*      | +6.01%*              | +1.77%   | +1.60%            | +8.90%*        |
| 4    | IV&V at Design       | +5.29%*      | +9.09%*              | +3.17%*  | +1.41%            | +7.66%*        |
| 5    | IV&V at Requirements | +5.62%*      | +9.64%*              | +3.46%*  | +0.67%            | +4.68%*        |

# GSD Model Structure





# Interaction Effects (IE)

- Capture the impact of GSD factors on productivity and defect generation rate.
- Interaction effect on productivity rate





#### **Evaluate Process Tradeoffs**

#### Task Allocation Strategy Alternatives





## **Ideal Situation**



- Duration when using follow-the-sun is 70% of the time it takes using single-site
- Module-based took a little longer than follow-the-sun



#### **Real World Situation**



- Follow-the-sun took about 37% longer than singlesite
- Module-based is the shortest



#### Key Questions GSD Models Can Address

- Impact of moving to multi-site development
- Impact of adding a new development site
- Task allocation strategy
- Multi-site QA strategy
- Impact of different development sites using different processes, people and technology
- Deals with issues due to cultural, language, time zone, productivity and cost differences
- Examines impact of personnel turnover and skills development



# Applications for System Acquisition

- Can assess impact of using prime with collection of subcontractors at different sites (i.e. software acquisition model)
- Impact of short funding government projects



#### Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance/ V&V Strategy for a project
  - □ IV&V Strategy
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies

# Cost/Benefit of New Technologies

**New LDD Technology** 7 level 4 sub-systems level1 CM1: 496 modules in 'C' а JM1: 10,885 modules in 'C' b PC1: 1.107 modules in 'C' level0 С level2  $\overline{NASA}$ level3 d KC1: 2,107 functions in 'C++' е level4 KC2: 523 functions in 'C+4 f a Stable accuracies accuracy 0.75 0.5 ~ effort 0.25 Massive changes in other measures 30 detectors, sorted by effort

#### **Changes to Process**



Changes to Model Reflecting Modified Process



Quantel

Quantitative Intelligence

#### **Results Showing Impact on NASA Projects**

| Total Size<br>(KLOC)<br>50% V&V | Total Effort +<br>IV&V (PM) | Total Effort<br>(PM) | Total Rework<br>Effort (PM) | Total Duration<br>(Month) | Average<br>Duration |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 99.79                           | 815.75                      | 815.75               | 198.30                      | 33.80                     | 29.48               |
| 4.00                            | 27.97                       | 27.97                | 8.58                        | 1.48                      | 1.26                |
| reinspect 5                     | 0% detcap IV&V              | = 0.05 & insp        | ect 10% with de             | etcap = 0.50              |                     |
| 99.79                           | 813.16                      | 807.16               | 190.02                      | 34.24                     | 29.32               |
| 4.00                            | 27.89                       | 27.89                | 8.35                        | 1.46                      | 1.26                |
|                                 | 2.59                        | 8.59                 | 8.28                        | -0.44                     | 0.16                |
| reinspect 5                     | 0% detcap IV&V              | = 0.05 & insp        | ect 10% with de             | etcap = 0.70              |                     |
| 99.79                           | 810.79                      | 804.79               | 187.74                      | 34.20                     | 29.27               |
| 4.00                            | 27.81                       | 27.81                | 8.13                        | 1.46                      | 1.25                |
|                                 | 4.96                        | 10.96                | 10.56                       | -0.39                     | 0.20                |
| reinspect 5                     | 0% detcap IV&V              | = 0.02 & insp        | ect 10% with de             | etcap = 0.50              |                     |
| 99.79                           | 814.93                      | 808.93               | 191.73                      | 34.28                     | 29.35               |
| 4.00                            | 27.87                       | 27.87                | 8.30                        | 1.46                      | 1.26                |
|                                 | 0.82                        | 6.82                 | 6.57                        | -0.47                     | 0.12                |

# General Business Case Questions

Quantel

- What is the impact of applying new tools and technologies?
- What is the economic benefit or value of the tool or technology? What is the *Return on Investment*?
- When is it useful and when might it be useless?
- Under what conditions does the tool or technology perform best?
- What performance standards does the tool need to achieve in order to have a positive return?
- Are there better ways to apply the tool?



#### Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance/ V&V Strategy for a project
  - □ IV&V Strategy
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and Make Better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities



#### **Incremental Development Model**





#### **Benefits of Process Simulation**

|   |                    | Project   |  |   |  |                              |                      |                     |  |                                  |            |       |
|---|--------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------|-------|
|   | Option             | Total<br>Effort<br>(PM) Dev<br>Eff + Dev<br>Rwk | Rework<br>Effort<br>Devel<br>Defects<br>(PM) | Project<br>Duration<br>(Calendar<br>Months) | Projected<br>Cost or<br>Revenue<br>delta due<br>to<br>Duration<br>Change | Total<br>Injected<br>Defects | Corrected<br>Defects | Escapted<br>Defects | Rework<br>Effort for<br>Field<br>Defects<br>(PM) | Impleme<br>ntation<br>Costs (\$) | NPV        | ROI   |
| 0 | Base Case          | 200   | 90   | 18  | \$0.00   | 1150                         | 990                  | 160                 | 40   | \$0.00                           | n.a.       | n.a.  |
| 1 | Implement QFD      | 190   | 75   | 17.5  | \$0.00   | 1150                         | 1020                 | 130                 | 30   | \$100,000                        | \$165,145  | 15%   |
| 2 | Implement VOC      | 185   | 75   | 17  | \$ 100,000   | 1150                         | 1050                 | 100                 | 20   | \$120,000                        | \$185,231  | 29%   |
| 3 | Add QuARS Tool     | 175   | 65   | 16  | \$ 300,000   | 1150                         | 1090                 | 60                  | 10   | \$ 80,000                        | \$289,674  | 88%   |
| 4 | Eliminate          | 230   | 130  | 22  | \$(400,000)  | 1150                         | 900                  | 250                 | 80   | \$0.00                           | -\$378,043 | -129% |
| 5 | Additional Process |   |  |   |  |                              |                      |                     |  |                                  |            |       |



#### Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance/ V&V Strategy for a project
  - □ IV&V Strategy
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and Make Better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities
- Architect, Design, and Documenting Processes



#### Architect, Design and Document Processes



Quantielligence

#### Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance/ V&V Strategy for a project
  - IV&V Strategy
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and Make Better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities
- Architect, Design, and Documenting Processes
- Estimate Project Cost from the Bottom-Up



# Using Process Simulation to perform early stage project cost estimation

- Study Conducted by Mizell, in the Engineering Assessment Directorate at KSC
- Applied Process Simulation to provide bottom-up cost and schedule estimates at multiple stages of the project (i.e. from Concept of Operations forward)
- Utilized real project data from KSC and SEL
- Developed estimates that incorporated effects for
  - Incremental Spiral processes
  - □ Impact of short funding projects



# NASA Model – Incremental Spiral Lifecycle



Adapted from Mizell, 2006



# Accomplishments of Mizell's Research

- Methodology to use simulation to provide interval estimates
- Developed probability distributions for size, productivity, and defects using organization specific data
- Provided confidence intervals for project estimates
- Combined system dynamics model with DES process model to analyze effects of turnover on project effort and duration
- Adapted incremental spiral process model
- Complete NASA project case study



## **Process Models Used**

- IEEE 12207 being used by NASA IV&V
- Adapted for incremental development
- Adapted for spiral development
- Incorporated system dynamics portions into model
- Model development supported by Quantel



## Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance/ V&V Strategy for a project
  - □ IV&V Strategy
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and Make Better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities
- Architect, Design, and Documenting Processes
- Estimate Project Costs from the Bottom-Up
- Manage Processes Quantitatively









#### PROMPT Control and Feedback Loop





## Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance/ V&V Strategy for a project
  - □ IV&V Strategy
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and Make Better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities
- Architect, Design, and Documenting Processes
- Estimate Project Costs from the Bottom-Up
- Manage Processes Quantitatively
- **Train Project Managers**



#### Teaching Software Project Management through Modeling (Navarro, et. al., 2006)





## **Benefits of Process Simulation**

- Decision Support and Tradeoff Analysis
- Sensitivity Analysis "What if"
- Supports Industry Certification and process improvement programs including CMMI, Six Sigma, and others
- Benchmarking
- Design and Define Processes/Metrics
- Bring Lessons Learned Repositories Alive
- □Can save cost, effort, and expertise
- Many ways to achieve High Value-Add by using process simulation



## **Bottom-Line**

- Process Simulation can make an impact on your business.
  - Improving QA strategies (defect containment, COQ, COPQ)
  - □ Achieving higher CMMI Levels (Fulfilling CMMI L4)
  - □ Implementing 6 Sigma practices
  - □ Adopting new technologies
  - □ Plan/replan projects
  - □ Bottom-up cost estimation
- Enables an organization to adapt to change and improve processes more quickly – beating the competition, win contracts
- Enables an organization to design processes better, train employees, implement more quickly = better performance, higher quality, faster



# The End

# **Questions?**





Applying Process Simulation to Achieve High-Value Benefits

David M. Raffo, Ph.D. Quantel, Inc. Software Engineering Institute Portland State University



# Agenda: Part II

- Overview of Simulation Types
- Process Tradeoff Analysis Method
  - 🗆 Data
  - Model Templates
  - Model Database
  - □ Analysis of Results
- Incremental Model tour
- Conclusions



## **Alternative Process Simulation Approaches**

- Modeling Paradigms
  - Knowledge-Based Systems
  - Agent Based
  - State-Based
  - Discrete Event
  - □ System Dynamics
  - Hybrid
- Research Outlets
  - Software Process:
    Improvement and
    Practice
  - Journal of Systems and Software

- Tools
  - Arena
  - ProModel
  - Extend
  - Stella
  - VenSim
  - Research tools
- Conferences
  - Winter Simulation Conference
  - SPW/ ProSim
  - SEPG
  - SSTC



#### **Alternative Process Simulation Approaches**

- Knowledge Based Systems
  - Person-in-the loop
  - □ Fine level of granularity
  - Supports process enactment
- Agent Based Systems
  - □ Fine level of granularity
  - Supports detailed work interactions
- State Based Systems
  - Captures flow of control (work activities, parallelism) well
  - Multi-view graphical representations
  - Difficult to capture task, work package and resource details



# Alternative Process Simulation Approaches

- Discrete Event Simulation
  - Able to represent richness of processes, work packages and resources
  - □ Good for modeling quantitative process performance
  - Good tool support
- System Dynamics
  - Captures feedback well
  - □ Often used for high level qualitative issues
- Hybrid
  - Captures best aspects of Discrete Event and System Dynamics
  - □ Models are complex
  - Being used to predict performance of multi-site development



# **Common Applications of Each Approach**

|                | STRAT | PLAN | MGMT | IMPR | UNDR | TRAIN |
|----------------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| KBS            |       |      |      |      | X    | X     |
| Agent Based    |       |      |      |      | Х    | Х     |
| State-Based    |       | Х    |      | Х    | Х    | X     |
| Discrete Event | X     | X    | X    | X    | X    | X     |
| System Dynamic | X     | X    |      | Х    | Х    | X     |
| Hybrid         | X     | Х    | X    | Х    | Х    | X     |

#### **Development Projects**

#### **Project and Process Data**

| CSCI Data (Follows | )                 |                  |        |       |               |         |           |      |    |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|-------|---------------|---------|-----------|------|----|
| No. of CSCIs       |                   | 8                |        |       |               |         |           |      |    |
| CSCI names:        | C&DH<br>Estimated | Guidance<br>SLOC | & NEPS | Groun | d DIVINER LAM | P LOLA  | LROC      |      |    |
| C&DH               |                   |                  |        |       |               |         |           |      |    |
| CSCname            | Reuse             | Re-eng           | New    | Lang  | Totals        | Ptotals | IVVTotals | EP ( | CP |
| C&DH               | 250               | 00               |        | 75000 | 100000        | 120000  | 150000    |      |    |
| Total              | 250               | 00               | 0      | 75000 | 100000        | 120000  | 150000    | 3    | 1  |
| Guidance & Nav     |                   |                  |        |       |               |         |           |      |    |
| CSCname            |                   |                  |        |       |               |         |           |      |    |
| Guidance & Nav     | 250               | 00               |        | 12000 | 37000         | 37000   | 39000     |      |    |
| Total              | 250               | 00               | 0      | 12000 | 37000         | 37000   | 39000     | 2    | 3  |

Organizational

- •Site and Project
- Industry Standard







Quantel

Better

**Process** 

**Decisions** 

ntelligence

| Projec | t Id:          | 1                              |                                   |   |                                     |   |  |   |
|--------|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
|        | <u>Run Set</u> | <u>Size</u><br>Mean<br>Sal Dev | <u>Effort</u><br>Mean<br>Stal Dev | <u>Rework Effor:</u><br>Mean<br>Stil. Dev | <u>Duration</u><br>Mean<br>Stel Dev | <u>Avg Duration</u><br>Mean<br>Stel Dev | <u>Corrected Defects</u><br>Mean<br>Stil Dev | <u>Latent Defect</u><br>Mean<br>Std Dev |
| -      | 1              | 58.00<br>1.63                  | 54.321.35<br>1.484.76             | 10.568.58<br>217.46                       | 3.572.02<br>63.39                   | 2.381.00<br>55.76                       | 2.756.13<br>77.96                            | 143.6<br>3.72                           |
| -      | 2              | 58.00<br>1.63                  | 53 666 85<br>1.511.91             | 9 573 17<br>298.02                        | 3 457 40<br>63.54                   | 2.266.06<br>66.44                       | 2 759 38<br>76.79                            | 140.40<br>4.82                          |
| -      | 3              | 58.00<br>1.63                  | 54 321 35<br>1.484.76             | 10.568.58<br>217.46                       | 3 572 02<br>63.39                   | 2.381.00<br>55.75                       | 2 756 13<br>77.96                            | 143.6<br>3.72                           |
|        | 4              | 58.00<br>1.63                  | 53 920 94<br>1.445.09             | 9 943 53<br>202.73                        | 3 500 50<br>52.74                   | 2310.60<br>53.75                        | 2 758 30<br>77.41                            | 141.4<br>43                             |



#### Where does the data come from? (1 of 2)

- Input data are used to predict the performance measures.
- Can be derived from the organization
  - Current baseline
  - Exemplary projects
  - Pilot data
- Can also be derived from
  - Expert opinion
  - Industry data from comparable organizations
- Best judgments to describe the state of your organization



#### Input Data (2 of 2)

#### Examples:

- process documents and assessments
- amount of incoming work
- effort based on size (and/ or other factors)
- defect detection efficiency
- effort for rework based on size and number of defects
- defect injection, detection and removal rates
- decision point outcomes; number of rework cycles
- hiring rate; staff turnover rate
- personnel capability and motivation, over time
- resource constraints
- □ frequency of product version releases



## **Creating Process Simulation Models**



•Joint Reviews



# **Customizing PATT**

Multiple block types implement SW development techniques

Development blocks develop product and inject defects



Inspection blocks detect defects



Testing blocks detect defects



Rework blocks correct and inject defects



Joint Review blocks detect and correct defects.



IV&V blocks detect defects.



# **Project Data Base**

#### Inputs

Size, productivity, error potential, consequence, defect injection, detection, and correction rates, cost, duration, etc.

#### Outputs

- Customizable reporting
- All levels Project, phase, activity levels
- Costs reported using COQ format
- Defect containment statistics
- □ Special reports for IV&V



# **Project Database**

| 📠 IEEE12207Data : Dat | tabase | e (Access 2000 file format)   | )   |                             |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|
| 🚰 Open 🕍 Design 🛅 Ne  | ew   🕽 | <   º <u>u</u> 🧽 🧱 🏢          |     |                             |
| Objects               | 2      | Create table in Design view   |     | Ivv_Step_Data               |
| Tables                | 2      | Create table by using wizard  |     | Ivv_Totals                  |
| 🗐 Oueries             | 2      | Create table by entering data | Ħ   | Parameter_Information       |
|                       |        | Entity_Info                   |     | Parameter_Names             |
|                       |        | Entity_List                   |     | Project_Activity_Efforts    |
| Reports               |        | Fan_Out                       | === | Project_Activity_Statistics |
| 🛍 Pages               |        | Input_Parameters              |     | Project_Data                |
| 📿 Macros              |        | Ivv_Activity_Statistics       | Ħ   | Project_Level_Info          |
| Se sadden             |        | Ivv_Input                     | === | Project_Phase_Data          |
| Kass Modules          |        | Ivv_Phase_Data                |     | Project_Phase_Statistics    |
| Groups                |        | Ivv_Phase_Statistics          | Ħ   | Project_Statistics          |
| 😹 Favorites           |        | IVV_Profiles                  |     | Project_Step_Data           |
|                       |        | Ivv_Statistics                | Ħ   | Project_Totals              |
|                       | <      |                               |     | >                           |



#### Objects Tables .... P Oueries -8 Forms F Reports Pages Macros æ Modules Groups Favorites

2

2

5

F

5

F

5

F

5

5

F



#### Development Project Total Effort/Duration Statistics

| Project Name   | : IEEE12      | 207 SW Develo       | ument Process i      | Model            |                      |                          |                       |
|----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Run Sor</u> | <u>Size</u>   | <u>Total Effori</u> | <u>Rework Effors</u> | <u>Dusation</u>  | <u>Avg. Duration</u> | <u>Corrected Defects</u> | <u>Latent Defects</u> |
|                | Mean          | Mean                | Mean                 | Mean             | Mean                 | Mean                     | Mean                  |
|                | Std. Dev      | Std. Dev            | Std. Dev             | Std. Dev         | Std. Dev             | Std. Dev                 | Std. Dev              |
| 1              | 98.59         | 57,876.16           | 30,541.63            | 5,364.34         | 2,631.64             | 5,878.40                 | 518.02                |
|                | 0.00          | 0.00                | 0.00                 | 0.00             | 0.00                 | 0.00                     | 0.00                  |
| 2              | 98.59         | 58,052.90           | 30,541.63            | 5,351.82         | 2,575.64             | 5,878.40                 | 518.02                |
|                | 0.00          | 0.00                | 0.00                 | 0.00             | 0.00                 | 0.00                     | 0.00                  |
| 3              | 98.59         | 60,804.74           | 33,233.51            | 5,545.17         | 2,557.96             | 5,804.28                 | 586.63                |
|                | 0.00          | 0.00                | 0.00                 | 0.00             | 0.00                 | 0.00                     | 0.00                  |
| 4              | 100.48        | 61,794.80           | 33,756.2.5           | 5,256.44         | 2,33.5.78            | 5,901.19                 | 596.30                |
|                | 0.00          | 0.00                | 0.00                 | 0.00             | 0.00                 | 0.00                     | 0.00                  |
| 5              | 98.59         | 58,632.66           | 30,541.63            | 5,452.80         | 2,645.37             | 5,878.40                 | 518.02                |
|                | 0.00          | 0.00                | 0.00                 | 0.00             | 0.00                 | 0.00                     | 0.00                  |
| 6              | 98.59<br>0.00 | 58,632.66<br>0.00   | 30,541.63<br>0.00    | 5,452.80<br>0.00 | 2,645.37             | 5,878.40<br>0.00         | 518.02<br>0.00        |

Saturday, November 11, 2006

Page 1 of 1



## **PATT** Architecture

#### Model Engine

PATT Model

- Simulation Model
- LC Templates
- Phases
- Blocks
- Connectors
- Libraries and Extensions

#### Database Engine

**PATT** Database

- Tables
- Custom Reports
- Model Specific
- PATT DB Structure

Analysis Engine PATT Output Analyzer • Sensitivity Analysis • Design of Experiments • Configuration Analysis



#### **Benefits of Process Simulation**

|   |                    | Project   |  |   |  |                              |                      |                     |  |                                  |            |       |
|---|--------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------|-------|
|   | Option             | Total<br>Effort<br>(PM) Dev<br>Eff + Dev<br>Rwk | Rework<br>Effort<br>Devel<br>Defects<br>(PM) | Project<br>Duration<br>(Calendar<br>Months) | Projected<br>Cost or<br>Revenue<br>delta due<br>to<br>Duration<br>Change | Total<br>Injected<br>Defects | Corrected<br>Defects | Escapted<br>Defects | Rework<br>Effort for<br>Field<br>Defects<br>(PM) | Impleme<br>ntation<br>Costs (\$) | NPV        | ROI   |
| 0 | Base Case          | 200   | 90   | 18  | \$0.00   | 1150                         | 990                  | 160                 | 40   | \$0.00                           | n.a.       | n.a.  |
| 1 | Implement QFD      | 190   | 75   | 17.5  | \$0.00   | 1150                         | 1020                 | 130                 | 30   | \$100,000                        | \$165,145  | 15%   |
| 2 | Implement VOC      | 185   | 75   | 17  | \$ 100,000   | 1150                         | 1050                 | 100                 | 20   | \$120,000                        | \$185,231  | 29%   |
| 3 | Add QuARS Tool     | 175   | 65   | 16  | \$ 300,000   | 1150                         | 1090                 | 60                  | 10   | \$ 80,000                        | \$289,674  | 88%   |
| 4 | Eliminate          | 230   | 130  | 22  | \$(400,000)  | 1150                         | 900                  | 250                 | 80   | \$0.00                           | -\$378,043 | -129% |
| 5 | Additional Process |   |  |   |  |                              |                      |                     |  |                                  |            |       |



# **Computations and Tradeoffs**

- Sensitivity Analysis
- Design of Experiments
- Business Case ROI, NPV
- Methods in use and available

Quantiative Intelligence

#### Demonstration of the Incremental Model





## **Simulation User-Levels**

- Level 1: Manager Runs simulations based on predetermined options
- Level 2: Analyst Able to add or change the process to study the impact of process changes
- Level 3: Expert Able to create new models from scratch
- Level 4: Developer Able to program new block and/or modify the logic of existing blocks, as allow by the security model
- Level 5: Originator Establishes security model



#### Process Tradeoff Analysis Method (PTAM)

- Based on extensive research into Software Process Modeling conducted in academia, SEI and industry.
- Graphical user interface and models software processes
- Integrates SEI methods to define processes and supports CMMI PAs (CMMI L4 QPM)
- Supports Industry Certification Programs including CMMI, Six Sigma, and others
- Benchmarking
- Integrates metrics related to cost, quality, and schedule into understandable project performance picture.
- Predicts project-level impacts of process improvements in terms of cost, quality and cycle time



#### Process Tradeoff Analysis Method (PTAM)

- Support business case analysis of process decisions - ROI, NPV and quantitatively assessing risk.
- Reduces risk associated with process changes by predicting the probability of improvement
- Saves time, effort and expertise over other methods



## Applying Process Simulation = High Value Add

- Evaluate Strategic Issues
  - Quality Assurance, V&V and IV&V Strategy for a project
  - Globally Distributed Software Development
- Assess the Costs and Benefits of Applying New Tools and Technologies
- Plan Processes and make better Tradeoff Decisions
- Evaluate Process Improvement Opportunities
- Architect, Design, and Document Processes
- Estimate Project Costs from the Bottom Up
- Manage Projects Quantitatively
- Train Project Managers
- Process Simulation can make a positive impact on your business!



# The End

# **Questions?**

