design quality and to provide indicators that will influence the approach taken to code generation and testing.

The intent of project metrics is twofold. First, these metrics are used to minimize the development schedule by making the adjustments necessary to avoid delays and mitigate potential problems and risks. Second, project metrics are used to assess product quality on an ongoing basis and, when necessary, modify the technical approach to improve quality.

As quality improves, defects are minimized, and as the defect count goes down, the amount of rework required during the project is also reduced. This leads to a reduction in overall project cost.

Another model of software project metrics [HET93] suggests that every project should measure:

- *Inputs*—measures of the resources (e.g., people, environment) required to do the work.
- *Outputs*—measures of the deliverables or work products created during the software engineering process.
- *Results*—measures that indicate the effectiveness of the deliverables.

In actuality, this model can be applied to both process and project. In the project context, the model can be applied recursively as each framework activity occurs. Therefore the output from one activity becomes input to the next. Results metrics can be used to provide an indication of the usefulness of work products as they flow from one framework activity (or task) to the next.

4.3 SOFTWARE MEASUREMENT

Measurements in the physical world can be categorized in two ways: direct measures (e.g., the length of a bolt) and indirect measures (e.g., the "quality" of bolts produced, measured by counting rejects). Software metrics can be categorized similarly.

Direct measures of the software engineering process include cost and effort applied. Direct measures of the product include lines of code (LOC) produced, execution speed, memory size, and defects reported over some set period of time. *Indirect measures* of the product include functionality, quality, complexity, efficiency, reliability, maintainability, and many other "–abilities" that are discussed in Chapter 19.

The cost and effort required to build software, the number of lines of code produced, and other direct measures are relatively easy to collect, as long as specific conventions for measurement are established in advance. However, the quality and functionality of software or its efficiency or maintainability are more difficult to assess and can be measured only indirectly.

We have already partitioned the software metrics domain into process, project, and product metrics. We have also noted that product metrics that are private to an

individual are often combined to develop project metrics that are public to a software team. Project metrics are then consolidated to create process metrics that are public to the software organization as a whole. But how does an organization combine metrics that come from different individuals or projects?

To illustrate, we consider a simple example. Individuals on two different project teams record and categorize all errors that they find during the software process. Individual measures are then combined to develop team measures. Team A found 342 errors during the software process prior to release. Team B found 184 errors. All other things being equal, which team is more effective in uncovering errors throughout the process? Because we do not know the size or complexity of the projects, we cannot answer this question. However, if the measures are normalized, it is possible to create software metrics that enable comparison to broader organizational averages.

4.3.1 Size-Oriented Metrics

? What data should we collect to derive size-oriented metrics?

Size-oriented software metrics are derived by normalizing quality and/or productivity measures by considering the *size* of the software that has been produced. If a software organization maintains simple records, a table of size-oriented measures, such as the one shown in Figure 4.4, can be created. The table lists each software development project that has been completed over the past few years and corresponding measures for that project. Referring to the table entry (Figure 4.4) for project alpha: 12,100 lines of code were developed with 24 person-months of effort at a cost of $168,000. It should be noted that the effort and cost recorded in the table represent all software engineering activities (analysis, design, code, and test), not just coding. Further information for project alpha indicates that 365 pages of documentation were developed, 134 errors were recorded before the software was released, and 29 defects

Project	LOC	Effort	$(000)	Pp. doc.	Errors	Defects	People
alpha	12,100	24	168	365	134	29	3
beta	27,200	62	440	1224	321	86	5
gamma	20,200	43	314	1050	256	64	6
•	•	•	•	•	•		
•	•	•	•	•	•		
•	•	•	•	•	•		

FIGURE 4.4

Size-oriented metrics

were encountered after release to the customer within the first year of operation. Three people worked on the development of software for project alpha.

In order to develop metrics that can be assimilated with similar metrics from other projects, we choose lines of code as our normalization value. From the rudimentary data contained in the table, a set of simple size-oriented metrics can be developed for each project:

- Errors per KLOC (thousand lines of code).
- Defects[4] per KLOC.
- $ per LOC.
- Page of documentation per KLOC.

In addition, other interesting metrics can be computed:

- Errors per person-month.
- LOC per person-month.
- $ per page of documentation.

Size-oriented metrics are not universally accepted as the best way to measure the process of software development [JON86]. Most of the controversy swirls around the use of lines of code as a key measure. Proponents of the LOC measure claim that LOC is an "artifact" of all software development projects that can be easily counted, that many existing software estimation models use LOC or KLOC as a key input, and that a large body of literature and data predicated on LOC already exists. On the other hand, opponents argue that LOC measures are programming language dependent, that they penalize well-designed but shorter programs, that they cannot easily accommodate nonprocedural languages, and that their use in estimation requires a level of detail that may be difficult to achieve (i.e., the planner must estimate the LOC to be produced long before analysis and design have been completed).

4.3.2 Function-Oriented Metrics

Function-oriented software metrics use a measure of the functionality delivered by the application as a normalization value. Since 'functionality' cannot be measured directly, it must be derived indirectly using other direct measures. Function-oriented metrics were first proposed by Albrecht [ALB79], who suggested a measure called the *function point.* Function points are derived using an empirical relationship based on countable (direct) measures of software's information domain and assessments of software complexity.

Function points are computed [IFP94] by completing the table shown in Figure 4.5. Five information domain characteristics are determined and counts are provided in

---

4   A defect occurs when quality assurance activities (e.g., formal technical reviews) fail to uncover an error in a work product produced during the software process.

Weighting factor

Measurement parameter	Count		Simple	Average	Complex		
Number of user inputs	☐	×	3	4	6	=	☐
Number of user outputs	☐	×	4	5	7	=	☐
Number of user inquiries	☐	×	3	4	6	=	☐
Number of files	☐	×	7	10	15	=	☐
Number of external interfaces	☐	×	5	7	10	=	☐
Count total							☐

the appropriate table location. Information domain values are defined in the follow-
ing manner:[5]

KEY POINT

Function points are
derived from direct
measures of the
information domain.

> **Number of user inputs.** Each user input that provides distinct application-
> oriented data to the software is counted. Inputs should be distinguished from
> inquiries, which are counted separately.
> **Number of user outputs.** Each user output that provides application-
> oriented information to the user is counted. In this context output refers to
> reports, screens, error messages, etc. Individual data items within a report
> are not counted separately.
> **Number of user inquiries.** An inquiry is defined as an on-line input that
> results in the generation of some immediate software response in the form of
> an on-line output. Each distinct inquiry is counted.
> **Number of files.** Each logical master file (i.e., a logical grouping of data that
> may be one part of a large database or a separate file) is counted.
> **Number of external interfaces.** All machine readable interfaces (e.g., data
> files on storage media) that are used to transmit information to another sys-
> tem are counted.

Once these data have been collected, a complexity value is associated with each
count. Organizations that use function point methods develop criteria for determin-
ing whether a particular entry is simple, average, or complex. Nonetheless, the deter-
mination of complexity is somewhat subjective.

To compute function points (FP), the following relationship is used:

$$FP = \text{count total} \times [0.65 + 0.01 \times \Sigma(F_i)] \tag{4-1}$$

where count total is the sum of all FP entries obtained from Figure 4.5.

---

5   In actuality, the definition of information domain values and the manner in which they are
    counted are a bit more complex. The interested reader should see [IFP94] for details.

The F_i (i = 1 to 14) are "complexity adjustment values" based on responses to the following questions [ART85]:

1. Does the system require reliable backup and recovery?
2. Are data communications required?
3. Are there distributed processing functions?
4. Is performance critical?
5. Will the system run in an existing, heavily utilized operational environment?
6. Does the system require on-line data entry?
7. Does the on-line data entry require the input transaction to be built over multiple screens or operations?
8. Are the master files updated on-line?
9. Are the inputs, outputs, files, or inquiries complex?
10. Is the internal processing complex?
11. Is the code designed to be reusable?
12. Are conversion and installation included in the design?
13. Is the system designed for multiple installations in different organizations?
14. Is the application designed to facilitate change and ease of use by the user?

Each of these questions is answered using a scale that ranges from 0 (not important or applicable) to 5 (absolutely essential). The constant values in Equation (4-1) and the weighting factors that are applied to information domain counts are determined empirically.

Once function points have been calculated, they are used in a manner analogous to LOC as a way to normalize measures for software productivity, quality, and other attributes:

- Errors per FP.

- Defects per FP.

- $ per FP.

- Pages of documentation per FP.

- FP per person-month.

4.3.3 Extended Function Point Metrics

KEY POINT

Extending function points are used for engineering, real-time, and control-oriented applications.

The function point measure was originally designed to be applied to business information systems applications. To accommodate these applications, the data dimension (the information domain values discussed previously) was emphasized to the exclusion of the functional and behavioral (control) dimensions. For this reason, the function point measure was inadequate for many engineering and embedded systems (which emphasize function and control). A number of extensions to the basic function point measure have been proposed to remedy this situation.

A function point extension called *feature points* [JON91], is a superset of the function point measure that can be applied to systems and engineering software applications.

The feature point measure accommodates applications in which algorithmic complexity is high. Real-time, process control and embedded software applications tend to have high algorithmic complexity and are therefore amenable to the feature point.

To compute the feature point, information domain values are again counted and weighted as described in Section 4.3.2. In addition, the feature point metric counts a new software characteristic—*algorithms.* An *algorithm* is defined as "a bounded computational problem that is included within a specific computer program" [JON91]. Inverting a matrix, decoding a bit string, or handling an interrupt are all examples of algorithms.

Another function point extension for real-time systems and engineered products has been developed by Boeing. The Boeing approach integrates the data dimension of software with the functional and control dimensions to provide a function-oriented measure amenable to applications that emphasize function and control capabilities. Called the *3D function point* [WHI95], characteristics of all three software dimensions are "counted, quantified, and transformed" into a measure that provides an indication of the functionality delivered by the software.[6]

The *data dimension* is evaluated in much the same way as described in Section 4.3.2. Counts of retained data (the internal program data structure; e.g., files) and external data (inputs, outputs, inquiries, and external references) are used along with measures of complexity to derive a data dimension count. The *functional dimension* is measured by considering "the number of internal operations required to transform input to output data" [WHI95]. For the purposes of 3D function point computation, a "transformation" is viewed as a series of processing steps that are constrained by a set of semantic statements. The *control dimension* is measured by counting the number of transitions between states.[7]

A state represents some externally observable mode of behavior, and a transition occurs as a result of some event that causes the software or system to change its mode of behavior (i.e., to change state). For example, a wireless phone contains software that supports auto dial functions. To enter the *auto-dial* state from a *resting state,* the user presses an **Auto** key on the keypad. This event causes an LCD display to prompt for a code that will indicate the party to be called. Upon entry of the code and hitting the **Dial** key (another event), the wireless phone software makes a transition to the *dialing* state. When computing 3D function points, transitions are not assigned a complexity value.

To compute 3D function points, the following relationship is used:

$$\text{index} = I + O + Q + F + E + T + R \tag{4-2}$$

---

6 It should be noted that other extensions to function points for application in real-time software work (e.g., [ALA97]) have also been proposed. However, none of these appears to be widely used in the industry.

7 A detailed discussion of the behavioral dimension, including states and state transitions, is presented in Chapter 12.

Semantic statements / Processing steps	1–5	6–10	11+
1–10	Low	Low	Average
11–20	Low	Average	High
21+	Average	High	High

where *I, O, Q, F, E, T*, and *R* represent complexity weighted values for the elements discussed already: inputs, outputs, inquiries, internal data structures, external files, transformation, and transitions, respectively. Each complexity weighted value is computed using the following relationship:

$$\text{complexity weighted value} \ = \ N_{il}W_{il} + N_{ia}W_{ia} + N_{ih}W_{ih} \tag{4-3}$$

where N_{il}, N_{ia}, and N_{ih} represent the number of occurrences of element *i* (e.g., outputs) for each level of complexity (low, medium, high); and W_{il}, W_{ia}, and W_{ih} are the corresponding weights. The overall complexity of a transformation for 3D function points is shown in Figure 4.6.

It should be noted that function points, feature points, and 3D function points represent the same thing—"functionality" or "utility" delivered by software. In fact, each of these measures results in the same value if only the data dimension of an application is considered. For more complex real-time systems, the feature point count is often between 20 and 35 percent higher than the count determined using function points alone.

The function point (and its extensions), like the LOC measure, is controversial. Proponents claim that FP is programming language independent, making it ideal for applications using conventional and nonprocedural languages; that it is based on data that are more likely to be known early in the evolution of a project, making FP more attractive as an estimation approach. Opponents claim that the method requires some "sleight of hand" in that computation is based on subjective rather than objective data; that counts of the information domain (and other dimensions) can be difficult to collect after the fact; and that FP has no direct physical meaning—it's just a number.