

Meteocal

Total Developing Hours

Software Engineering 2

A.A. 2014/2015

Fabrizio Ferrai
Germano Gabbianelli
Andrea Grazioso

9 febbraio 2015

Parte I

Stima con UFP

1 Analysys

We are able to split functionalities of CalCARE in 5 categories classifying them on the complexity level, accordingly to the *function point* schema. The weighted average for each category and for each level of complexity permit us to define an evaluation of the KLOC.

Tabella 1: Legend FP symbols

Simbol	Meaning
s	simple functionality
m	medium functionality
c	complex functionality

1.1 Internal logic file

Dataset of the application accessed via Database interactions.

Tabella 2: FP per ILF

File	Points
users	1s
events	1s
forecasts	1s
events_forecasts	1s
cities	1s
notification_type	1s
weather_conditions	1s
notifications	1s
partecipations	1s
calendars	1s
Total	10s

1.2 External logic file

Set of data generated and/or managed by external entities.

Tabella 3: FP per ILF

File	Points
forecasts	1m
Total	1m

1.3 External input

Elaboration from external sources including feedbacks without elaboration.

Tabella 4: FP per EI

Functions	Points
Login, logout	2s
Registration and confirmation	2s
Password Retrieval/Reset	2s
Event invitation	1s
Event creation/modification	1m
Event delete	1s
Calendar view	2s
Total	10s+1m

1.4 External output

Set of operation that generate data for external use.

CalCARE does not provide this sort of output.

1.5 External inquiry

Elementar operations which produce data in reply to an external input, without meaningful elaboration.

Tabella 5: FP per EInq

Inquiry	Points
User search	1s
Event Detail	1s
Settings	1s
Total	3s

2 Recap

What follow is a brief recap of the UFPs and the associate conversions to KLOC.

Tabella 6: Summary FP per category

Category	Points	Weight
Internal logic file	10s	$10 \times 7 = 70$
External logic file	1m	$1 \times 4 = 4$
External input	10s+1m	$10 \times 3 + 1 \times 4 = 34$
External output	0	0
External Inquiry	3s	$3 \times 3 = 9$
Total	–	117 UFP

Assuming the coefficient and values of LOC/UFP as reported in the following tables and assuming that the project as been implemented in the majority in java, followed by javascript and a little part of HTML, we are able to derive an evaluation of the KLOC

Tabella 7: FP Constants

Category	s	m	c
Internal logic file	7	10	15
External logic file	5	7	10
External input	3	4	6
External output	4	5	7
External Inquiry	3	4	6

Tabella 8: Conversion table LOC/UFP

Language	LOC/UFP
Java	53
Javascript	47
HTML	34

Tabella 9: KLOC Calculation Table

Language	Estimated Ratio
Java	0.75
Javascript	0.2
HTML	0.05

As result:

$$(0.75 \times 53 + 0.2 \times 47 + 0.05 \times 34)loc/ufp \times 117ufp = 5,9kloc$$

Parte II

Hour count

3 Code

3.1 Data

Tabella 10: Sintetic hour count per person

Person	Hours count	Equivalent days/worker
Ferrai	78h	13
Gabbianelli	82h	14
Grazioso	69h	12
Totale	229h	

3.2 Metrics

The finite project counts:

Tabella 11: Line of codes count

Language	Line of codes
Java	3865
Javascript	675
HTML	491
Totale	5031

3.2.1 CoCoMo II

Following the CoCoMo model:

$$S = 5.031, \quad \begin{cases} Effort = 2.49 \times 1.0 \times S^{1.0997} \approx 14.71 & \text{Men/ Month} \\ Duration = 3.67 \times Effort^{0.3179} \approx 8.62 & \text{Month of work} \\ N = \frac{M}{T} \approx 1.70 & \text{\# of team member} \end{cases}$$

According to the model there should have been 2 person at work for 8 month.

Note: Our numbers are quite different because of several reason, first of all that our student condition doesn't allow us to work as real developers.

3.3 Considerations

The real KLOC are about 15% more than the one calculated by UFPs, but we can assume that the evaluation is enough accurate.

4 Documentation

Apart from code, the documentation part of work has been splitted as follow:

Tabella 12: Documentation hour count

Activity	Ferrai	Gabbianelli	Grazioso
Documentation	1	1	1
Web-repository mantainance	–	0.5	–
Installation Manual	0.5	0.5	2
Hour count	–	–	2
Total	1.5	2	5