Join Us In Las Vegas - Be a Speaker!

Deborah Harris, Conference Committee Chair

The 2007 International Software Measurement & Analysis (ISMA) Conference invites you to participate in this exciting annual event. It is an excellent opportunity to present your exceptional ideas and share your experiences in measurement and analysis techniques. It offers a chance to mingle with the best and brightest—quality professionals, just like you!

We are looking for conference content that covers the depth and breadth of subjects important to all measurement specialists. Topics may be geared to the novice as well as the seasoned professional. Your colleagues are interested in hearing about obstacles you overcame, and rewards you experienced, in establishing measurement programs. They want to know what process improvement activities made the difference for your development organization. They want to learn about new and innovative ideas to successfully tackle old problems. Creativity is welcomed! The agenda is not limited to traditional presentation styles. So proposals for papers, panels, roundtables, posters/demonstrations and games. Yes, games!

Here’s your opportunity to share your ideas and experiences from the world of software measurement and analysis with people across the industry. Looking for feedback on an innovative concept? This is the place to try it out. We’re looking for the best you have to offer – be creative, and think outside the box! And maybe you can see a few flops, split some aces, or catch a show while you’re in town…

**Dates to Remember:**
- **May 14** - Abstracts Due
- **May 28** - Speaker Notification
- **July 18** - Presentation Materials Due

**Potential Topics**
- Metrics
- Process Improvement
- Function Points
- Case Studies
- Project Management
- Executive Management
- Other Functional Metrics
- Software Estimation
- Data Analysis
- Data Presentation
- And any other innovative idea you can come up with!

So complete an online abstract submission form at [http://ifpug.org/conferences/submissionform.aspx](http://ifpug.org/conferences/submissionform.aspx)
From the IFPUG Board...

Mauricio Aguiar, President

Following an eventful year in 2006, IFPUG greets 2007 with more than the usual amount of innovation. After being held in the US for many consecutive years the traditional IFPUG Spring event was held in Vancouver, Canada the last full week in April. I agree it is not as if we were made it to Korea or India (although I hope we will host an event in a place like that sooner than later), but selecting a different destination for a conference is something that every organization with “International” on its name should do once in a while. The Vancouver event featured the second Functional Sizing Summit (FSS) after the success of the first FSS in Cambridge. This was an opportunity for people with an interest in Functional Sizing to get together and discuss the latest developments in the area with the old and new gurus. This event also showcased the pilot of IFPUG’s newest educational offering – distance learning! Over 40 people took advantage of the opportunity to participate in the FSS presentations and discussion remotely.

As if this were not enough, September will take us to Las Vegas for the second ISMA Conference. The International Software Measurement and Analysis event will certainly bring us luminaries such as Watts Humphrey who was with us at ISMA 2006 in San Diego. I can’t wait to see what the IFPUG Conference Committee has in store for the next edition of this highly successful event. I believe even those of us who are used to going to casinos are going to gasp at the huge Vegas facilities.

Although it is great to have those two wonderful events to look forward to, there is more to IFPUG than learning, networking, and having fun. The Board, the Counting Practices Committee, and several IFPUG members have been working hard on improving the function point counting technique through a lively discussion that started at the ISMA Conference in San Diego. Many different points of view and perspectives have been heard, a motion has been made, and the membership has made a first decision. The IFPUG Board will continue to guarantee that all members have equal opportunities to be heard and to vote on any decision that may impact the counting rules.

It is also very exciting to know that the IFPUG Certification Committee is investigating how to automate the CFPS exam. It has become increasingly difficult to handle almost 1,000 exams a year! The Certification Committee has been in contact with major global automated certification providers and I am sure we will have good news for all existing and aspiring CFPS in the near future.

Last but not least, I hope you find this newsletter informative, useful, and fun to read.
Software Industry Events

- May 3, 10, 17, 22, 24 and June 7 and 14 Software Best Practices Conferences Multiple Locations www.itmpi.org/events/


- May 29-31 IT Governance Summit Johannesburg, South Africa www.iqpc.com/cgi-bin/templates/genevent.html?

May 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSQT West Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>PSQT West Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>PSQT West Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>PSQT West Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>PSQT West Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>PSQT West Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software BP Conference Albany, NY</td>
<td>CPFS Regional Exam MADRID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- June 18-21 Systems and Software Technology Conference (SSTC) Tampa, FL www.stsc.hill.af.mil/conference/
Chapter News

This section brings our readers information and updates on current and new IFPUG Chapters from around the globe. By discussing what goes on in these local chapters we hope to share lessons learned and best practices with those who will benefit from them.

If your chapter has news you would like to share, send a note to CMC@ifpug.org.

Brazilian Function Point Users Group

BFPUG: An Example of Chapter Excellence

As the primary Brazilian organization promoting the utilization of IFPUG Function Points, BFPUG (Brazilian Function Point Users Group) has become a reference in Brazil since its inception in 1998. Currently Function Points are being used in Brazil in several ways: for software sizing and estimation, productivity analysis and even for billing purposes. Boasting more than 250 Certified Function Point Specialists, Brazil is a leading edge country in Function Point certification and utilization.

The BFPUG website at http://www.bfpug.com.br/ is a source of information about Function Points and metrics in Brazilian Portuguese. The site became a reference for practitioners where they can find information about CFPS exams, general news about Function Points, articles for free download, and how to sign-up for the BFPUG Yahoo discussion group.

BFPUG coordinates all Regional CFPS exams in Brazil. There are typically two exams per year involving 3 major Brazilian cities: Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Brasilia, serving an average of 100 examinees per semester.

The BFPUG Yahoo forum, with over 1000 registered members, is another highly successful BFPUG initiative. Every message is moderated and there are strict rules against misuse (e.g. advertising, messages unrelated to Function Points, SPAM, etc.). More than 70 messages are received monthly with peaks of 100-120 messages near CFPS exams.

All BFPUG work is done by volunteers in coordination with the IFPUG Certification Committee and the IFPUG office.

Spanish Function Point Users Group

SFPUG: Promoting Function Points in the Business and Academic Worlds

The Spanish Function Point User Group has been created last summer led by the Information Engineering Research Unit at the University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain and supported by other Spanish universities (The University of the Basque Country, University of Seville, University of Huelva, University of Cádiz University of Oviedo, and the University of the Balearic Islands) and by Spanish or international companies with branches in Spain such as El Corte Ingles, Indra, Soluziona, Sopra Profit, EDS and Accenture.

SFPUG has been created with the aim of serving a meeting point for all those Spanish companies and organizations with interests in software measurement in general and Function Points in particular. To do so, SFPUG will organize a series of events including courses, conferences, user groups meeting and seminars related to different aspects of functional software measurement; it is worth mentioning that SFPUG participates in the International conference Mensura on Software Process and Product Measurement. Furthermore, SFPUG will organize the first edition in Spain of the official IFPUG-CFPS certification. The exam will take place this June in Madrid.

Counting On You

The focus is of this section is Q&A on function point counting or measurement issues, helpful hints on counting function points, or other helpful tips and hints from the world of software measurement and function points.

IFPUG relies on YOU, the IFPUG community, for this content (yet another way for you to participate)! So if you have something you’d like to share or questions you would like answered, send them to CMC@ifpug.org.

Understanding Boundaries

I am working on a project that has 3 distinct parts: a database, a metadata store, and a GUI. I am confused about the application boundary. The manual says "the boundary is determined based on the user’s point of view." The user knows that there are a database and metadata store (the user can specify the URLs) but only interacts with the GUI (the user’s point of view). On the other hand, the original SLOC Estimates and the effort (which are associated measurement data) are split into 3 groups. The database and the metadata store will be installed on separate machines. The GUI will be integrated into an application on a third machine. Where are my application boundaries? (I performed the count with 3 application boundaries and I feel the estimate was low. I fear that putting the boundary around all 3 pieces will result in an even lower estimate. If I am counting functions from both sides of a transaction due to the application boundary [say an add routine where the GUI talks to the database], am I inflating the function point count?)

On a side note, can a GUI be an ILF or an EIF? Thanks a million.

Boundary Clarification

Your problem is that you have too much technical knowledge of the system. Put yourself in the shoes of a comfortably computer-illiterate end user and start over.

The user wants some data permanently stored with the ability to add, change, and delete records. That’s an ILF and 3 EIs.

Metadata? That word is not even in the vocabulary of most end users. If the metadata store contains information they asked you to store, then it satisfies a business requirement and may be an ILF. If not, it’s only satisfying a technical requirement.

Keep the concept of "elementary process" firmly in mind. The passing of data from one component of the system to another is not usually an elementary process. Data comes in, all kinds of stuff happens to it, and it gets stored; that’s an elementary process. Data is retrieved, all kinds of stuff happens to it, and it gets printed, displayed or transmitted; that’s an elementary process. The number of different computers or databases it passes through is irrelevant.

If you’ve got applications passing data back and forth to each other but this movement only occurs for technical reasons, and my hypothetical end user who just traveled here from 1960 wouldn’t even be interested in hearing about it, then you’ve drawn your application boundaries too small. There are instances in which parts of one elementary process are performed by two different applications and you have to ignore one of them. But those instances should be rare enough that you don’t lie awake worrying about cheating yourself out of a lot of Function Points.

As for the data being spread over different computers, that’s purely a matter of technical efficiency or perhaps a manifestation of the limits of current technology, but it’s not a business requirement.
In my opinion these counts are not usually worth the effort because, 1. It is a very substantial effort, this is really hard work, and 2. The delivery rate and quality metrics you get aren't useful for comparison with other projects and systems, you can't compare a GUI to a communications controller and certainly not to application software. They're only good for bragging, which admittedly is the reason some managers want them.

A nutshell is the reason the world now uses FP to measure software instead of SLOC.

It is possible to do FP counts of computing tools, interfaces, middleware, infrastructural software, etc. You have to adjust your definition of "end user" since the "end users" of this type of software are likely to be programmers and other technicians, and other software. It is a major challenge to define the "end user perspective" in this environment.

An ILF or an EIF is a more-or-less permanent store of business data. I don't see how a GUI could be one of those. Remember that all data of interest to the end users is not necessarily business data. Users may store their preferences for screen colors, sounds, etc., but that is still technical data relating to the computing environment, not the business.

As for the looming discrepancy between your original SLOC figures and your FP figures: That in a nutshell is the reason the world now uses FP to measure software instead of SLOC.

In my opinion these counts are not usually worth the effort because, 1. It is a very substantial effort, this is really hard work, and 2. The delivery rate and quality metrics you get aren't useful for comparison with other projects and systems, you can't compare a GUI to a communications controller and certainly not to application software. They're only good for bragging, which admittedly is the reason some managers want them.
Committees at Work

IFPUG could not exist or succeed without the hard-working, dedicated volunteers that make up our various committees. We do not always see everything these committees do, so this section is intended to provide some insight into current activities.

Management Reporting Committee

Since the inception of the Certified Software Measurement Specialist (CSMS), the Management Reporting Committee has pursued two purposes. The first is to develop and support a certification that reflected the interests of the IFPUG community as evidenced in our initial membership survey four years ago. Included in this first purpose is the need to communicate the two-step certification process and facilitate the offering of the CSMS exam. In this regard, we are grateful for those of you who have ventured into the new world of the CSMS, especially IFPUG affiliates in Italy who have pioneered such offerings in the international community.

The second purpose, and actually one that pre-dates the CSMS, is the role of the MRC in sustaining a body of knowledge (BoK) associated with the use of measurements by management. Historically, the Guide-lines to Software Measurement has served the IFPUG community with a wide array of measurement related topics from numerous contributors. More recently the measurement community has benefited from the emergence of models like the CMMI® and approaches like PSM, GQM, Six Sigma, and Balanced Scorecard. Because of the prevalence and prominence of these approaches, the MRC will over the next year, complete a migration path towards these as its BoK.

Accompanying the transition will be pilot testing and the release of an electronic syllabus (web page) that points candidates to available material. It is our intention to minimize, if not avoid completely, costly components of the new BoK. Advantages related to this transition include: a more widely recognized and accepted BoK, reduced ambiguity in terms and usage in the GSM, reduced support and maintenance for the GSM, and potentially better strategic relationships with other measurement communities and their memberships.

The MRC anticipates the piloting of the new exam throughout the summer concluding at the ISMA Conference at the fabulous Flamingo in world famous Las Vegas. Again, completion of this transition is planned for 2008. This transition does not impact anyone who has a CSMS today or testing through the transition; that is, as promoted, your CSMS is good for three years from the date of issue.

Members—Heidi Belkofer, Dawn Coley, Barbara Beech, Betsy Clark, Bill Hufschmidt, Greg Allen, Al Hoefer, and Pierre Almen—look forward to seeing you in Las Vegas in September!
Committees at Work [continued]

IT Performance Committee

The IT Performance Committee (ITPC) presented a revised version of MS222 at ISMA Conference in San Diego. The course now titled “Principles of Estimating and Benchmarking Using Industry Data” will be presented again in Las Vegas. The revised course content includes:

✓ Estimating
  • An overview of estimating methods
  • Producing quality estimates using industry data
  • Estimating case study
✓ Sources of data
  • Learning how to use metrics and experience of other organizations
  • Overview of the ISBSG benchmark data repository
✓ Benchmarking
  • The role of metrics programs in moving your organization towards Leading Practice

The Course was very well received, and the participants especially liked the examples and practical techniques presented.

Your ITPC is currently working on a Project Attributes Study which will identify the most common and influential set of user imposed and organizational attributes, develop a clear definition and consistent method for quantifying these attributes, and propose methods for using these attributes in conjunction with function points to manage software development projects including, but not limited to, the level of effort required for requirements implementation.

Some of you may have responded to our attributes survey conducted in San Diego. We are currently studying the survey results, but have been delayed since the departures, after many years of excellent work, of David Herron and George Mitwasi from the committee. Thank you, David and George!

We are currently looking for new committee members, so make sure your volunteer forms are on file, and, as always, we need additional projects for the ISBSG repository. If your organization can submit projects please visit the IFPUG Website (www.ifpug.org), the ISBSG Website (www.isbsg.org) or e-mail me at msb_2@sbcglobal.net to get project submission materials.

The ITPC "meets" via conference call on a monthly basis. Our next "face to face" meeting will be at the Fall Conference in Las Vegas. Come to the Conference, stop in and see us, and feel free to give us your input.

Current ITPC Members are:
Dan Bradley – Chair
Wendy Bloomfield
Christine Green
Loredana Frallicciardi - Director

New Environments Committee

The New Environments Committee (NEC) is positioned to deliver a number of whitepapers to the membership. The NEC and the Counting Practices Committee have developed improved techniques to review and gain concurrence on NEC whitepapers. These methods will allow us to publish our papers more efficiently and on a regular basis. We are in the final steps to publishing a white paper focused on counting data warehouse applications. The next paper to be submitted will address the more intricate issues around counting Graphical User Interfaces. Thank you for your support.

Committee members:
Roger Heller, Q/P Management Group – Chair
Steven Woodward, Q/P Management Group – Vice Chair
Dawn Coley, EDS
Dan French, GEICO
Deb Maschino, Q/P Management Group
Tammy Preuss, AT&T
## Regional CFPS Exam Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Madrid, Spain| Friday, June 8, 2007 | 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. | Universidad de Alcalá, Edificio Politécnico Despacho O-246 Carretera de Barcelona Km. 31,7. 28805 – Alcalá de Henares | Juan J. Cuadrado-Gallego
Phone: 34918856640
Email: jjcg@uah.es |
| Mexico City, Mexico | Saturday, June 16, 2007 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. | IBM Calzada Legaria 853 Colonia Irrigación México City, D.F. 11500 Mexico | Sergio Jimenez Rubion
Phone: 52 55 5270-4450
Email: sjimner@mx1.ibm.com |
| Bangalore, India | Friday, June 22, 2007 | 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. | Exam Hall (Staff Canteen) Indian Institute of Management Bangalore Bannerghatta Road Bangalore, India | Ashwin Krishnamurthy
Phone: 91-80-28057855
Email: indiafpd@in.ibm.com |
| Rio de Janiero, Brazil | Sunday, June 24, 2007 | 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. | Hotel Gloria Rua do Russel, 632 Gloria, Rio de Janiero, Brazil | Mauricio Aguiar
Phone: 55 11 3721 7036
Email: mauricio@metricas.com.br |
This space is for you to express your opinions about industry trends, techniques, or other areas. Or tell us what you think about a previous issue, share your thoughts on what IFPUG could be doing better to serve you, or things you might want to see at a future ISMA conference. This is your opportunity to sound off—send your editorial to CMC@ifpug.org.

Letter from the Editor

Multiple Media Update

In response to the Multiple Media Update note in the February issue of A World of Information, IFPUG received several e-mails with questions about the voting results of the Multiple Media Motion. The article noted that that the motion passed by a margin of 71% to 29%, but several people questioned the actual number of members who voted.

These astute readers brought up a very good point. In response, let me provide the information that should have been in the original article. 125 total votes were cast, 89 were in favor of the motion, 36 were against it. Counting individuals (single votes), corporate (two votes each), and worldwide corporate memberships (five votes each), IFPUG calculated the total possible number of votes to be 858. This results in a turn out rate of just about 15 percent. So by no means did a majority of the IFPUG community approve the motion — only a majority of those that actually voted. But as in any democracy, if you don’t vote, you don’t get counted.

This illustrates a couple of things. First, it’s a great lesson in metrics and the need to look at more than just one of them when drawing conclusions and making decisions. Having multiple measures that provide information (and different viewpoints) about a single topic is essential to having a measurement program that is meaningful and successful. Better decisions can be made with “triangulated” measures. Second, it tells us all that voter apathy in IFPUG is pretty widespread. Only 15 percent of IFPUG’s voters participated in this special referendum? That’s pretty low, considering the import of the subject that we are dealing with here. Sure, not everyone cares about this issue — and not everyone even understands what this issue is all about. But anyone who was at the IFPUG Annual Meeting at the ISMA Conference in San Diego last year knows that passions run high on this issue and that the outcome is very important to function points as a standard for software size and to IFPUG as an organization.

So get involved. When we have elections, vote. When we have events, plan on attending. When you see a post on the bulletin board that piques your interest, post a response. Send in an editorial to the next issue of MetricViews or A World of Information. IFPUG is your organization. Get involved!
Company/Organization/Individual _______________________________________________________________
Mailing & Billing Address _______________________________________________________________________
City _________________________________________________________________________________________
State/Province ________________________________________________________________________________
Country ____________________________________ Zip/Postal Code _________________________________
Telephone (_______) __________________________ Fax (_______) _________________________________
E-Mail _______________________________________________________________________________________
Where did you hear about IFPUG?

Indicate Your Membership Choices (Membership year runs July 1 – June 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Legal Entity, One Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Additional Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Corporate</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/College</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w/o copy of CPM)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Electronic copy of CPM)</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Names/Addresses
(For Corporate Memberships Only)

1. Name: _____________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________
City: ________________________________________________
State/Province: ________________Zip/Postal Code: ________
Country: _____________________________________________
Phone: (_______) ______________________________________
Fax: (_______)________________________________________
E-Mail: ______________________________________________

2. Name: ______________________________________
Address: ______________________________________
City: _________________________________________
State/Province: ____________Zip/Postal Code: _____
Country: ______________________________________
Phone: (_______) _______________________________
Fax: (_______)_________________________________
E-Mail: _______________________________________

(WORLDWIDE CORPORATE APPLICANTS PLEASE LIST ADDITIONAL CONTACTS ON THE REVERSE)

Method of Payment
(Check One)

☐ Check/Money Order
☐ Charge To:
☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA ☐ American Express
#
Exp. Date _______________________________
Signature _______________________________________

IMPORTANT! All International Payments must be in the form
dues payment must accompany application. Purchase orders
are not accepted.
Payments to the International Function Point Users Group are not
deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes.
However, they may be deductible under other provisions of the Internal
Revenue Code.

You can also join Online at: www.ifpug.org

Return to: IFPUG • 191 Clarksville Road • Princeton Junction, NJ 08550 • Phone: 609-799-4900 • Fax: 609-799-7032
IFPUG is a non-profit, member governed organization. The mission of IFPUG is to be a recognized leader in promoting and encouraging the effective management of application software development and maintenance activities through the use of Function Point Analysis and other software measurement techniques. IFPUG also provides a forum for networking and information exchange that promotes and encourages the use of software product and process metrics. IFPUG is the governing body for the Certified Function Point Specialist (CFPS) and Certified Software Measurement Specialist (CSMS).

Save the Date!
September 9 - 14, 2007
Flamingo Las Vegas Hotel
Join us for the premier software measurement conference!