
|  |
| --- |
| Description: C:\Users\ASHISAI\Desktop\HIT Team\Logo HIT\Logo_New_New.png**Team Assignment 03** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **HIT** |
| **3/2/2012** |
|  |

**Software Measurement and Analysis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Team members:** | **Members ID** |
| **Giang Thị Ha Thanh** | T097828 |
| **Trần Dũng Đạt** | T095716 |
| **Nguyễn Vũ Trọng Giang** | T096656 |
| **Huỳnh Chấn Huy** | T096498 |
| **Tạ Quang Hiệp** | T090363 |
| **Nguyễn Trần Hồng Phúc** | T095014 |

***Each team presents a GQM chart for one assigned Viking project goal:***

***- Increase project schedule predictability by 10%***



**Our group was assigned to use GQM chart for the following achieved goal:**

**Goal:**  **Increase project schedule predictability by 10%**

To improve the estimation is accurate, it depend on hands-on experiences of previous project. In the Viking project, team uses the Matador project to compare the estimation that was increase an accurate over 10%.

1. **Using historical Data**

Team uses the Matador project to compare the estimation that was increase an accurate over 10%.

To come up the question at the beginning such as: the interaction of elements to schedule, cost, quality, resource and then we can give metrics and collect necessary data.

We have four perspectives to make question:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 1.1 | What was the accuracy of Matador’s duration estimating? |
| **Metric 1.1** | Actual duration to finish Matador: A1 (measured by days)  Estimate duration to finish Matador: E1 (measured by days) |
| **Deviation 1.1** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 1.2 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s duration estimating? |
| **Metric 1.2** | Actual duration to finish Viking: A2 (measured by days)  Estimate duration to finish Viking: E2 (measured by days) |
| **Deviation 1.2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 1.3 | What was the rate of improvement over the duration estimating of Viking project compare to previous project (Matador)? |
| **Metric 1.3** | R1 from Question 1.1  R2 from Question 1.2 |
| **Deviation 1.3** | The prediction increases 10% when R1 - R2 >= 10% → Goal accomplished |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 2.1 | What was the accuracy of Matador’s cost estimating? |
| **Metric 2.1** | Actual cost to finish Matador: A3 (measured by USD)  Estimate cost to finish Matador: E3(measured by USD) |
| **Deviation 2.1** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 2.2 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s cost estimating? |
| **Metric 2.2** | Actual cost to finish Viking: A4 (measured by USD)  Estimate cost to finish Viking: E4(measured by USD) |
| **Deviation 2.2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 2.3 | What was the rate of improvement over the cost estimating of Viking project compare to previous project (Matador)? |
| **Metric 2.3** | R3 from Question 2.1  R4 from Question 2.2 |
| **Deviation 2.3** | The prediction increases 10% when R3 - R4 >= 10% → Goal accomplished |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 3.1 | What was the accuracy of Matador’s human resource estimating? |
| **Metric 3.1** | Actual human resource to finish Matador: A1 (measured by man)  Estimate human resource to finish Matador: E1 (measured by man) |
| **Deviation 3.1** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 3.2 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s human resource estimating? |
| **Metric 3.2** | Actual human resource to finish Viking: A2 (measured by man)  Estimate human resource to finish Viking: E2 (measured by man) |
| **Deviation 3.2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 3.3 | What was the rate of improvement over the human resource estimating of Viking project compare to previous project (Matador)? |
| **Metric 3.3** | R1 from Question 3.1  R2 from Question 3.2 |
| **Deviation 3.3** | The prediction increases 10% when R1 - R2 >= 10% → Goal accomplished |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 4.1 | What was the accuracy of Matador’s defect estimating? |
| **Metric 4.1** | Actual defect found in Matador: A3 (measured by number of defect)  Estimate defect found in Matador: E3 (measured by number of defect) |
| **Deviation 4.1** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 4.2 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s defect estimating? |
| **Metric 4.2** | Actual defect found in Viking: A4 (measured by number of defect)  Estimate defect found in Viking: E4(measured by number of defect) |
| **Deviation 4.2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 4.3 | What was the rate of improvement over the defect estimating of Viking project compare to previous project (Matador)? |
| **Metric 4.3** | R1 from Question 3.1  R2 from Question 3.2 |
| **Deviation 4.3** | The prediction increases 10% when R3 - R4 >= 10% → Goal accomplished |

1. **Using Wideband Delphi and Parametric**

Develop WBS to divide project into small tasks, then using Parametric method to estimate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 5.1 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s effort estimating when using parametric? |
| **Metric 5.1** | PM = A \* (Size)B   PM = Effort (person months)   A = Constant representing productivity   Size = Software size   B = Accounts for relative economies of scale, and are determined by rating specific scaling factors |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 5.2 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s schedule estimating when using parametric? |
| **Metric 5.2** | Estimate Schedule in Viking using parametric: E5(months)    M = Estimate person months for project |
| **Metric 5.2** | Actual schedule in Viking: A5 (months)  Deviation: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 6.1 | What was the accuracy of Viking’s schedule estimating when not using parametric? |
| **Metric 6.1** | Actual schedule in Viking: A6 (months)  Estimate Schedule in Viking not using parametric: E6(months)  Deviation: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question 7.1 | What was the rate of improvement over the schedule estimating of Viking when using parametric and not using parametric? |
| **Metric 7.1** | The prediction increases 10% when R6 – R5 >= 10% → Goal accomplished |