COCOMO II Tabellen

Wählen Sie jeweils die Spalte nach dem subjektiven Mittelwert für Tabellen der einzelnen Grössenfaktoren und Kostentreiber.

Early Design Model

Grössenfaktoren

Größenfaktor SF_i	**sehr klein**	**klein**	**nominal**	**hoch**	**sehr hoch**	**extra hoch**
PREC: Erfahrung m. ähnl. Projek-ten; SF_1	nicht bekannt 6,20	weitgeh. unbek. 4,96	etwas vertraut 3,72	grunds. vertraut 2,48	weitgeh. vertraut 1,24	sehr ver-traut 0,00
FLEX: Flexibilität; SF_2	starr 5,07	minimal lockerer 4,05	etwas lockerer 3,04	grunds. Vorgab. 2,03	wenige Vorgab. 1,01	gener. Ziele 0,00
RESL: Architektur/ Risikobehand-lung; SF_3	wenig (20 %) 7,07	etwas (40 %) 5,65	oft (60 %) 4,24	generell (75 %) 2,83	meistens (90 %) 1,41	vollst. (100 %) 0,00
TEAM: Teamzusam-menhalt; SF_4	s. schw. Interakt. 5,48	schw. Interakt. 4,38	kooper. Interakt. 3,29	gute Interakt. 2,19	sehr gt. Interakt. 1,10	ausgez. Interakt. 0,00
PMAT: Prozessreife; SF_5	Level 1 7,80	Level 1 6,24	Level 2 4,68	Level 3 3,12	Level 4 1,56	Level 5 0,00

Precedentedness (PREC)

Feature	Very Low	Nominal / High	Extra High
Precedentedness			
Organizational understanding of product objectives	General	Considerable	Thorough
Experience in working with related software systems	Moderate	Considerable	Extensive
Concurrent development of associated new hardware and operational procedures	Extensive	Moderate	Some
Need for innovative data processing architectures, algorithms	Considerable	Some	Minimal

Development Flexibility (FLEX)

Feature	Very Low	Nominal / High	Extra High
Development Flexibility			
Need for software conformance with pre-established requirements	Full	Considerable	Basic
Need for software conformance with external interface specifications	Full	Considerable	Basic
Premium on early completion	High	Medium	Low

Team Cohesion (TEAM)

Characteristic	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra HIgh
Consistency of stakeholder objectives and cultures	Little	Some	Basic	Considerable	Strong	Full
Ability, willingness of stakeholders to accommodate other stakeholders' objectives	Little	Some	Basic	Considerable	Strong	Full
Experience of stakeholders in operating as a team	None	Little	Little	Basic	Considerable	Extensive
Stakeholder teambuilding to achieve shared vision and commitments	None	Little	Little	Basic	Considerable	Extensive

Architecture / Risk Resolution (RESL)

Characteristic	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Risk Management Plan identifies all critical risk items, establishes milestones for resolving them by PDR.	None	Little	Some	Generally	Mostly	Fully
Schedule, budget, and internal milestones through PDR compatible with Risk Management Plan	None	Little	Some	Generally	Mostly	Fully
Percent of development schedule devoted to establishing architecture, given general product objectives	5	10	17	25	33	40
Percent of required top software architects available to project	20	40	60	80	100	120
Tool support available for resolving risk items, developing and verifying architectural specs	None	Little	Some	Good	Strong	Full
Level of uncertainty in Key architecture drivers: mission, user interface, COTS, hardware, technology, performance.	Extreme	Significant	Considerable	Some	Little	Very Little
Number and criticality of risk items	> 10 Critical	5-10 Critical	2-4 Critical	1 Critical	> 5 Non-Critical	< 5 Non-Critical

Process Maturity (PMAT)

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capability_Maturity_Model

PMAT Descriptors	CMM Level 1 (lower half)	CMM Level 1 (upper half)	CMM Level 2	CMM Level 3	CMM Level 4	CMM Level 5
Rating Levels	Very Low	Low	Nominal	Highre	Very High	Extra High

Kostentreiber

EM_i	extra klein	sehr klein	klein	nominal	groß	sehr groß	extra groß
RCPX	0,49	0,60	0,83	1,00	1,33	1,91	2,72
RUSE	-	-	0,95	1,00	1,07	1,15	1,24
PDIF	-	-	1,00	1,00	1,00	-	-
PERS	2,12	1,62	1,26	1,00	0,83	0,63	0,50
PREX	1,59	1,33	1,12	1,00	0,87	0,74	0,62
FCIL	1,43	1,30	1,10	1,00	0,87	0,73	0,62
SCED	-	1,43	1,14	1,00	1,00	1,00	-

Product Reliability and Complexity (RCPX)

	Extra Low	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Emphasis on reliability, documentation	Very little	Little	Some	Basic	Strong	Very Strong	Extreme
Product complexity	Very simple	Simple	Some	Moderate	Complex	Very complex	Extremely complex
Database size	Small	Small	Small	Moderate	Large	Very Large	Very Large

Required Reuse (RUSE)

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
RUSE		none	across project	across program	across product line	across multiple product lines

Platform Difficulty (PDIF)

	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Time and storage constraint	≤ 50%	≤ 50%	65%	80%	90%
Platform volatility	Very stable	Stable	Somewhat volatile	Volatile	Highly volatile

Personal Capability (PERS)

	Extra Low	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Combined ACAP and PCAP Percentile	20%	39%	45%	55%	65%	75%	85%
Annual Personnel Turnover	45%	30%	20%	12%	9%	5%	4%

Personnel Experience (PREX)

	Extra Low	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Applications, Platform, Language and Tool Experience	≤ 3 mo.	5 months	9 months	1 year	2 years	4 years	6 years

Facilities (FCIL)

	Extra Low	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
TOOL support	Minimal	Some	Simple CASE tool	Basic life-cycle tools	Good; moderatel	Strong; moderatel	Strong; well integrated
Multisite conditions	Weak support of complex multisite development	Some support of complex M/S devel.	Some support of moderately complex M/S devel.	Basic support of moderatel y complex M/S devel.	Strong support of moderatel y complex M/S devel.	Strong support of simple M/S devel.	Very strong support of collocated or simple M/S devel.

Schedule (SCED)

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
SCED	75% of nominal	85%	100%	130%	160%	