It has been over 10 years since IFPUG has hosted an event outside of the United States. That is all changing April 22, 2007 when the IFPUG Spring Workshops and Functional Sizing Summit kicks off at the Sheraton Wall Centre hotel in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Much of IFPUG’s growth over the past few years has been in the international community, so IFPUG wanted to acknowledge this with a truly international event.

Vancouver is a great location, and an attractive destination for many travelers, especially coming east from the continent of Asia. Surrounded by spectacular natural beauty, the City of Vancouver is recognized as one of the world’s most livable cities, renowned for its innovative programs and leading in the areas of sustainability, accessibility and inclusivity. Vancouver is the largest city in the province of British Columbia. It's surrounded by water on three sides and is nestled alongside the Coast Mountain Range. Vancouver is home to spectacular natural scenery and a bustling metropolitan core, and boasts one of the mildest climates in Canada.

The U.S. Travel Industry requires that Western Hemisphere travelers (both U.S. and international) get a passport. Parents should also get a passport for their children regardless of age if they will be accompanying adults on such trips.

For information regarding visas and entry requirements for Canada, please call Immigration Canada at 1-888-242-2100 (in Canada) or visit their website at www.cic.gc.ca. From outside Canada, please contact the nearest Canadian Embassy, High Commission, or consulate in your region.

More details on this event can be found on page 3 in the Calendar of Events, and on pages 4 and 5 in the Workshops and Functional Sizing Summit Previews. And for an overview of Vancouver attractions, check out page 6.
IFPUG offers numerous opportunities for collaboration and interaction. The possibilities are significantly broader than just showing up at a conference (although you really should try to make it to the Functional Sizing Summit in Vancouver) or voting for board members. Subscribe to the bulletin board, get involved on a committee, join a local chapter (or better yet start one), or write a board member. Get involved and let your voice be heard. Help IFPUG continue to grow and adapt to meet your needs.

In the past few months, a lot has occurred in the IFPUG universe. Two of the most prominent events were the resurrection of the MetricViews magazine and the occurrence of the multi-media vote. All IFPUG members were asked to participate either by voting or by commenting. Both of these activities are forms of participation. Participation is the current buzzword in the innovation world. Technology, such as email and bulletin boards, has enabled the process to be more collaborative while extending the circle of those that can collaborate. Ideas can be shared and built upon much like a progressive story. Crowds have the wisdom that can be leveraged to build a story into more than what one person could anticipate. The big “however,” though, is that for collaboration to occur, more than a few people must participate.

“Get involved and let your voice be heard. Help IFPUG continue to grow and adapt to meet your needs.”

And Speaking of Technology…

The Software Process and Measurement Cast, SPaMCAST, is a podcast (time sliced internet radio) that explores the varied world of software process improvement and measurement. The cast covers topics that deal with the challenges found in information technology organizations as they grow and evolve. SPaMCAST typically follow a format that begins with a commentary or essay followed by an interview and listener comments. The interviews will address the wide range of software process improvement or measurement topics. The list of topics and interviews that are currently scheduled include:

♦ Process and Product Quality Assurance
♦ Estimation
♦ Software measurement
♦ Function Points
♦ Other Functional Metrics
♦ Outsourcing the Measurement Process

To listen in, go to iTunes or http://spamcast.libsyn.com/.

Note: SPaMCAST is not an IFPUG product. IFPUG neither sponsors nor endorses it and is not responsible for its content.
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Join IFPUG in Vancouver for the Spring Workshops and Functional Sizing Summit April 22-26
Spring Workshops Feature New Courses

Pam Simonovich, Education Committee Chair

You Asked for IT—You Got IT!

So, just how much fun is it sitting in a workshop for 8 hours LISTENING to all the wonderful ways you should be able to apply Function Point Analysis? I’ve read the reviews and felt your pain!

The Education Committee is very excited about offering something NEW, something BOLD, and something UNIQUE!!! Don’t be scared, we haven’t gotten rid of the entire old format, just jazzed it up… A LOT!

Sunday and Monday still promises to provide you the basics, the test preparations, and some advanced courses. However, starting Monday, new classes have been added! Bill Hufschmidt wants you to challenge him with all your weird, crazy “stuff” – PUT HIM TO THE TEST! Sheila Dennis will not let you leave her classroom without putting together a comprehensive measurement PROGRAM for your organization!

Thursday offers something very new and very exciting! Half day workshops where you will roll up your sleeves and TRY IT! Our Thursday 1/2 day workshops are designed to give you what you have been asking for. These workshops are mostly based on what you will be hearing during our 2 days of Summit. The Summit will just tease you, the workshops will allow you to ask, to try, and to succeed with the Function Point Methodology!

Robyn Lawrie will be coming all the way from Australia to show you how to contain your creeps!! I mean, scope creep of course! Steve Woodward (our resident Canadian) will spend his whole day with us on Thursday. In the morning he will get you through using EFFECTIVE measures, not just the flavorful measure of the week! In the afternoon he is going to take on RISK. Our own Carol Dekkers will conduct two half day workshops as well. The first is guaranteed to make all those “special words” that everyone misunderstands clear – FINALLY!! And speak to how common sense might be our saving grace when it comes to those zero function point enhancements – UGH! Tom Cagley is going to get down and dirty with “Blogs, WIKIs, Podcasts and Second Life” live and in color!

So, what are you waiting for?? Sign-up NOW!

IFPUG has taken your feedback seriously and has used your suggestions to develop a new approach to some new workshops!

http://www.ifpug.org/educational/registrationForm.htm

2007 Spring Workshops and Functional Sizing Summit

April 22 - 26, 2007
Sheraton Wall Centre Hotel
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2R9 CANADA
www.sheratonvancouver.com
It’s that time of year again, when Hollywood is on everyone’s mind, as it honors its best of the year. Well, Hollywood banks on great sequels following blockbuster hits of the past, and IFPUG is no different. April 24-25, 2007 will herald in the 2nd Annual Functional Sizing Summit in a location known as a popular film location – Vancouver, Canada! We hope you can join IFPUG as we celebrate our craft – software sizing, and honor our own stars in the following categories:

♦ Best Lyrical Interpretation, **Bill Hufschmidt**, Counting Conventions and Practices

♦ Best Performance by an Ensemble Cast, **Dr. N. V. Balasubramanian**, Metrics in Component Based Software Engineering

♦ Best Adaptation in New Environments, **Tom Cagley**, Counting New Medias: Blogs, WIKIs, Podcasts and Second Life

♦ Best Journalistic Interpretation, **Ray Boehm**, Use Case Points: What, (How,) When and Where

♦ Best Roadmap to Count Data Functions, **Ian Brown**, Using Entity-Relationship Diagrams to Count Data Functions

♦ Best Visual Effects, **Steve Woodward**, The Logical View of More Functionality

♦ Best Editing, **Carol Dekkers**, Demystifying FP – Let’s Clarify Terminology

♦ Best Technical Direction, **Siddharth Sawney**, Functional Sizing of Data Warehouses

♦ Best Director, **Terry Vogt**, Program Management with Requirements Based Measurement

♦ Best Gastronomic Effects, **Royce Edwards**, The Function Point Cookbook

♦ Best Visual Effects, **Robyn Lawrie**, Hiking in a Fog – Using Function Points to Navigate to Successful Software Delivery

♦ Best Sound Effects, **Tammy Preuss**, Press 1 for “How to Count”; Press 2 for “IVR”; Press 3 for “using Function Points”

♦ Best Newcomer, **Kimberly Ovuka**, FPA: A Beginner’s Perspective

Now that you have the lineup, the next step is to cast your ballot (that is, register) to be a part of this outstanding event! Go to the Functional Sizing Summit on the IFPUG website for presentation details and registration information.

Come network and share ideas with others at the 2007 Functional Sizing Summit!

Speakers include recognized industry experts as well as new faces!
To See and Do in Vancouver

Vancouver, with a rare blend of cosmopolitan amenities, natural splendors and cultural attractions is a uniquely exciting destination.

Popular scenic attractions include the Vancouver Aquarium Marine Science Center where you can experience the BC Coast in wonderful detail. For the adventurous, walk across the famed Capilano Suspension Bridge – a 450 foot suspension bridge over an Evergreen forest. The glass walled elevator, Vancouver Lookout! at the Harbour Centre Tower offers visitors a 360 degree view of the city that in the evening sparkles with city lights. The Skyride at Grouse Mountain offers enclosed gondola style cars will take you up 3700 feet for spectacular views of the ocean and mountains surrounding Vancouver.

Vancouver is also home to wonderful galleries and museums including the Vancouver Art Gallery that showcases modern and historical artists. The University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology is famous for the native art collections on display; also the Vancouver Museum offers an unbeatable introduction to the history of the city.

No visit to Vancouver is complete without experiencing the lush 1000 acres of beautiful Stanley Park. The world famous Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Classical Chinese Garden located within Stanley Park is a place of beauty and serenity in the midst of this thriving city that will amaze visitors any time of year.

Vancouver is made up of fascinating neighborhoods, from the cobbled streets (wear flat shoes!) of historic Gastown to the colorful excitement of Chinatown, home to Canada’s largest Chinese population. Art galleries, shops, restaurants and cafes are numerous throughout the city. Robson Street is a sure bet for shoppers of all kinds from big name stores to funky boutiques. Located in the heart of downtown Vancouver, Granville Street is where you will find the main nightlife district. Since its rebirth as host of Expo ’86, Yaletown has been transformed into one of Vancouver’s hottest neighborhoods filled with sidewalk cafés and restaurants. Granville Island Public Market offers merchants selling fresh seafood and produce but art collectors will be amazed at the plethora of galleries. You’ll want to enjoy a sunset dinner oceanside overlooking a marina, a wonderful way to end the day.

The performing arts thrive in Vancouver, enriched by the cities diverse population. From innovative comedy, theatre and Broadway extravaganzas to sporting events and nightlife, Vancouver can offer exciting options for your evening’s enjoyment. To help bring these events to the cities visitors, “Tickets Tonight”, is Vancouver’s only Day-of –Show Half Price ticket outlet similar to 2fer programs offered in other major cities. They are a full service Ticketmaster for regular advanced tickets as well. Online they can be reached at “ticketstonight.ca” for more information.

Let’s not forget the site of your conference, the Sheraton Wall Centre offering the 10,000 square foot Vida Wellness Spa and fitness center complete with a 50 foot indoor lap pool. The hotel is surrounded by a 1.5 acre outdoor garden and offers dining opportunities at their Indigo Bistro and Café One restaurants.

Harbour boat tours, double decker tour buses and many more tour options are available.

Vancouver is a wonderful adventure, not to be missed.
NEED SOMETHING TO SMILE ABOUT?

JOIN STICKYMINDS.COM, THE MOST COMPREHENSIVE ONLINE RESOURCE TO FIND THE SOLUTIONS YOU’RE LOOKING FOR.

Offering an unrivaled scope of original articles from industry experts, StickyMinds.com is your library for technical papers, industry news, tools and books, discussion forums, and more. StickyMinds.com is the Web’s first and most popular interactive community exclusively engaged in improving software quality throughout the software development lifecycle.

StickyMinds.com also hosts four eNewsletters—the StickyLetter, the What’s New Gram, the Sticky ToolLook and Between the Lines—keeping members up to date on industry news, trends, and events.

Membership is free, so keep a smile on your face everyday by joining StickyMinds.com today!

Covering all areas of the software development lifecycle with content devoted to:

- Managing People & Projects
- Define Requirements
- Design & Architecture
- Development & Deployment
- Test & Evaluation
- Process Improvement
- Measurement & Reporting
- Configuration Management
- Defect Tracking
- Security
I am new to the world of function points and I have a few questions regarding counting FPs and productivity calculations...

**PRODUCTIVITY USING FPs**
Consider that there are two applications, both sized at 500 FPs. One application is coded in C#.NET and another is coded in COBOL. Although the functionality delivered to the user is the same, the time to code the program in COBOL will take longer than the C#.Net coding.

Therefore, how can a metric such as FP/Work Day (or any other unit of time) be a valid productivity metric? This can also vary depending on the number of skilled resources there are assigned to the development effort.

How can FP/Resource and Hour/FP be used without knowing the duration and team size, respectively?

For example, let’s say the industry average for FP/FTE is 40. (I’m just guessing on this number) The question is over what duration of time is one resource able develop 40 FPs? Or if the industry average for Hour/FP is 10 - the questions is how many resources were working those 10 hours.
Yes, I know...I am using industry averages because I have no internal historical data.

**COUNTING FPs**
There are instances when following the IFPUG method does not take into account certain functionality that required development effort and maintenance. As I understand it code tables are not counted according to the IFPUG rules. But why? ... especially when these tables are being maintained and require significant development effort.
Also, when performing a FPA admin functionality is not counted.

However, what if the admin are also users of the system. Would they still no longer be counted?
As far as code tables and admin use...it seems like not counting these can potentially exclude a large percentage of a system.

I apologize if these questions were asked before, but any comments would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks!

---

**Questions from a Rookie**

*I have a few questions regarding counting FPs and productivity calculations...*
Welcome to the brave new world of software measurement. I will take a stab at answering your questions. First let me say that IFPUG is a great source for software measurement information. There are a number of publications, classes and conference tracks that are specifically direct to new comers in your position. Check out the IFPUG Website for publication and training information. Here are but a few:

- Guidelines for Software Measurement
- Practical Project Estimation
- FP-101: Introduction to Function Point Counting; Basics
- MS-211: Software Metrics Definition, Analysis and Reporting
- MS-222: Principles of Estimating and Benchmarking Using Industry Data

You are correct there are dozens of “soft factors” that can affect productivity and quality. That is why it is so important to collect “soft factor” information regarding a software project. This will allow you to assess the software development process and benchmark it effectively. The above mentioned resources cover this information and so much more.

As a sidebar, the basic definition of productivity is goods or service produced per unit of time or dollar. A functional size metric such as IFPUG Function Points is a measure of the software functionality. It can be used with an element of time or dollar value to produce a productivity rate. An FTE is a very large unit of time and is not used in productivity rates. Productivity rates are usually stated in FP/HR or FP/Person Month. Remember you measuring the process not people, FP/Resource is not a valid unit of measure. Once again size is the foundation for true assessment of productivity and quality.

Counting Function Points.

If the explanation in the Counting Practices Manual is not clear take a class in Function Point counting. This will better help you understand the difference between code data, business data, and reference data. You have not provided enough information to determine if your specific case is truly code data.

Here is an excerpt from the Counting Practices Committee regarding the clarification of code data. I hope this is helpful.

Statement of Issue

Multiple interpretations of the IFPUG rules on how to count code tables

Scope

Create a clearer definition on how to count code tables based on a logical view:

- Use ISO definitions as a guide

Reason for Project

Lack of consistency in counting code tables

Codes tables & their maintenance can contribute up to 30% of a count but are often identified by the developers as a solution to the users “quality” requirements rather than their “functional” requirements.

Goals and Benefits

Improved consistency & accuracy

Improved image of FPA through a more objective approach to identifying files

Easier counting for novices

Avoidance of artificially inflated counts through counting all data stored in tables

Counts which are more "auditable"

End Result Format

Clarification of when to count “codes data” & how it should be counted.

After detailed research, CPC determined that Code Data was counted in a variety of ways: as separate ILFs and EIFs, individually counted, combined into a common single ILF, or not at all. The new publication sets the standard and method for identifying the type of data involved, and then the rules for counting.

Further guidelines in classifying data has been provided. Data is classified as Business Data, Reference Data or Code Data. Business Data and Reference Data support the “Guidelines for Counting Logical Files”, Addendum to CPM 4.1; Code Data should not be counted. The publication further defines guidelines of which transactions should not be counted that involve Code Data.

I hope this information is of some assistance.
Counting On You (continued)

Answers for a Rookie, Part Deux

In regard to your first original question and Jim’s response. There are really two definitions of productivity, and you are only citing 1 (I will call that economic productivity). The other is the ratio of actual productivity to expected productivity. (See my article: Productivity Measurement - Is Your Program Complete?; MetricViews, February 1995.) So in your example of two equally sized projects (actually size in a normalizer, so it does not matter (too much) what their sizes are) the expected and observed difference in the economic productivity is apparently the difference in the languages (the assignable cause). IMO industry data is limited in its utility, and that would not include comparing individual or small groups of projects with “averages” or other aggregated data. I am also attaching a “sources of variation” chart where “industry data” would correspond to “Multiple Organizations”. To actually use data “from column to column”, you need to understand the variation for each element where there is an influence. Perhaps some subscription data may have some of this explanation; but what is in the public domain, so far as I am aware, does not. Also, you would need to know when the data is from, since there have been changes in the CPM that have material effects on FP counts. Finally, say you did have well documented, audited, benchmark data (full statistics). It would have come from companies that have achieved some degree of measurement proficiency to be included. One of the main reasons we are here is because it is well shown that investment in measurement has a significant return in improvement in productivity, so expect the benchmark to be significantly higher than your own comparable results. If you show close or higher, I would be suspicious of your measurement first.

Chances are, if you are doing a valid comparison, you won’t be able to get acceptance of the benchmarks or their validity as a fair comparison. That said, benchmarking is a powerful and useful tool, but it must be in the right hands.

For the second part of your question, this will sound like a trite answer. FP is a rule based method. It is more important that you know what the rules say than it is that you understand why they say it. The rules say we don’t count things associated with non-functional requirements (which are now explained at length). They have always said that. Recently, that has been clarified significantly as to how it relates to “code data” and implementation (which would include system administration).

So, I have some opinions as to why is says that. First is my opinion that if the rules did not say that, we would not be here talking about it. If we were to mix independent and dependent variables in our analysis, FP would be on the scrap heap with a whole lot of other methods that have come and gone during FP’s tenure. Take some simple examples like the benchmark discussion. Say the benchmark contributions are counted to the rules (they would not be consistent nor of much use if they were not). What would be valid about a comparison of a count including code tables with a group that did not?

Another simple example would be to look at a well written functional spec (end user functionality only - no implementation elements) with a good logical ERD and DFD. Say there is no change in the functional specs (hypothetical remember) during the course of the project. The completed physical ERD and DFD will have all of the implementation decisions included by the development team, including code tables and any integrated admin functionality. The design FP should be substantially the same as the implementation FP, right? Not if you count the code tables and the admin functions, then the counts won’t be close. Further, the many possible implementations would all have a different FP count for the same end user functionality, if the implementation items were included.

Of course none of that means you cannot or should not consider “implementation” and “quality” variables in your use of FP. It just means you can’t reflect it in the count. Hopefully you will be with us long enough to develop an understanding and appreciation for the what may now seem like some silly and nonsensical discipline.

“If we were to mix independent and dependent variables in our analysis, FP would be on the scrap heap with a whole lot of other methods that have come and gone during FP’s tenure.”
Committees at Work

*IFPUG could not exist and 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.*

**Certification Committee**  
Kriste Lawrence, Certification Committee Chair

This past year has broken the record and is now our busiest exam year to date. We have provided 27 Regional Exams as well as sponsoring exams at the Functional Sizing Summit and International Software Measurement & Analysis Conference. Over 1,100 exams were taken at these exam sessions. Due to the various requests around the globe, we have been able to offer several exams translated to the local language. We are very thankful to our language translators and reviewers. Exams have been translated into Italian, Portuguese, Korean and Japanese.

As you can tell, the Certification Committee has been busy creating and grading all of those exams by hand. This leads us to where we may be headed in the future. At a request from the Board of Directors, a sub-committee has been formed of members of the Certification Committee, Management Reporting Committee and Board of Directors. We are investigating the various options available to us in automating all or part of the Certified Function Point Specialist (CFPS) exam. We are too early in the investigation to make any promises or provide any dates as to when this may occur.

Additionally, a number of individuals have chosen to extend their CFPS certification through use of the Certification Extension Program (CEP). This program allows you to extend your certification two times prior to retaking the exam. We have published a new release of the CFPS Certification Extension Program document. The new release allows certification extension credit for attending, delivering, and authoring function point counting presentations at IFPUG affiliate and chapter conference. The extension duration was also extended to three years. We recommend that you download a copy of the document from the IFPUG website.

Look for more information in upcoming IFPUG publications!

---

In 2007, the Certification Committee administered over 1,100 exams—by far the most ever in a year!

---

Join IFPUG at the Sheraton Wall Centre Hotel in Vancouver April 22-26th

Click here to make reservations: Sheraton Wall Centre Reservations
IFPUG and ISO
Carol Dekkers, ISO Task Force

Note: If you are already familiar with the work that your IFPUG ISO task force and ISO has done to standardize functional size measurement, please skip through to the last section (page 12), where Carol wants your input about future IFPUG/ISO collaboration.

ISO 9000
ISO 9000 is one of the most commonly cited ISO standards in the history of international standardization. So popular is it that the average “Joe Public” (an American idiom meaning the average person) will immediately chant “ISO 9000” when the acronym ISO (International Organization for Standardization) is mentioned. This worldwide quality standard is only one out of thousands of international standards published by the ISO, and its software engineering variant is one of hundreds published specifically for software and systems engineering.

An IFPUG/ISO Retrospective
IFPUG entered the world of ISO standards in 1994 when a formal working group (called Working Group 12 or WG12) devoted specifically to Functional Size Measurement was formed within the Joint Technical Committee (JTC1) of the software and systems subcommittee (SC7). If you’ve been an IFPUG member for more than a year or read this column over the years, you already know that the world of ISO standards is one rife with acronyms, politics, hierarchies, and formalities.

I have been fortunate to navigate through what has been sometime turbulent waters with the able assistance of my IFPUG task force co-members (both who are IFPUG past presidents): Mary Bradley of MSB2, and Frank Mazzucco, of Compass America.

In addition, many other IFPUG members and functional size measurement supporters have participated in WG12 through their home country’s national body delegation to ISO including:

- Australia: Pam Morris, Martin D’Souza, Oliver Hague, and Hugo Rehesaar
- Canada: Serge Oligny and Alain Abran
- England: Peter Fagg, Tony Rollo, Paul Goodman, and Charles Symons
- Finland: Pekka Forselius and Risto Nevalainen
- Germany: Eberhard Rudolph
- Ireland: Marie O’Neill
- Japan: Shigeru Nishiyama and Jackie Takahashi
- Korea: Insoo Hwang and Jin Kyung-Moon
- USA: Carol Dekkers, Mary Bradley, Frank Mazzucco, Susan Burgess, John Phippen and Jim Moore

Other countries sometimes participated in meetings specifically Brazil, France, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, and others. (My apologies if I have left out anyone inadvertently!)

IFPUG Return-on-Investment (ROI)
After many meetings and many excursions overseas by IFPUG ISO task force members, you may be wondering ‘what is the ROI to an IFPUG member with our participation in ISO standards?’ Here is a short list of the accomplishments and results we’ve delivered that increase the value of your IFPUG membership:

- IFPUG Function Points are now an ISO standard. We worked hard to ensure that the IFPUG Function Point Method received formal ISO recognition. Currently ISO/IEC 20926 is the IFPUG ISO standard based on IFPUG CPM 4.1 unadjusted (note: unadjusted FP conform to the ISO definition of functional size measurement), and we are working with the Counting Practices Committee (CPC) and ISO leadership to upgrade the ISO standard to the new CPM 4.2 level.
- IFPUG is a Category C liaison member of ISO. This means that IFPUG has been able to provide input to ISO in two ways – both as a member of the US national body through
ISO Task Force (continued)

ISO News on Functional Size Measurement

Several activities are underway in ISO related to Functional Size Measurement and standards. In the last year two new ISO/IEC JTC1 SC7 WG12 standards were published and are now available directly from ISO:

♦ 14143-6: Guide to Functional Size Measurement related standards: This standard is the final in the 14143 series of standards and is the umbrella standard to navigate readers through the 14143 series (Parts 1-5) and the 4 ISO/IEC conformant functional size measurement methods (IFPUG, NESMA, Mark II, and COSMIC-FFP).

♦ 14143-1:2007: This is an updated version of the original Concepts of Functional Size Measurement standard first published in 1998. It defines what is Functional Size and describes the mandatory provisions (“shall” statements) for Functional Size Measurement (FSM) and Functional Size Measurement Methods.

Additionally, two additional activities are underway. These are:

♦ PAS ballot to transpose the 5th ISO conformant Functional Size Measurement Method: the Finnish Software Measurement Association, FiSMA 1.1 method by ISO/IEC Joint Technical Committee 1. This is a 6 month ballot for which voting is underway.

♦ Revisions of two existing ISO Functional Size Measurement Methods: Because the maximum lifespan of a published ISO standard is five years, it must undergo a periodic review after that time and either be withdrawn (in the case of it being obsolete), affirmed without change, or be revised. Two such standards are nearing completion of their revisions for submission to ISO: 1. Our IFPUG Counting Practices Committee is putting the final touches on the IFPUG 4.2 unadjusted functional size measurement method to replace (i.e. revise) the current standard ISO/IEC 20926 IFPUG 4.1 unadjusted; and, 2. The COSMIC-FFP consortium is updating the published COSMIC-FFP method.

In the coming years, the final two ISO FSM standards, Mark II and NESMA, will also undergo a periodic review.

American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and also as a formal international liaison member. Your input and voice has been amplified through this participation!

♦ IFPUG members can pride themselves as being a part of a suite of unrivalled ISO standards. In fact, under the governorship of Pam Morris and Marie O’Neill, Working Group 12 delivered what ISO SC7 leaders declare as “one of the most useful and concise standards to stand the test of time in SC7” through the ISO/IEC 14143-1:1998: Concepts of Functional Size Measurement. Just recently, this standard was updated and reaffirmed as a 2007 ISO standard. IFPUG members can be proud of our participation.

♦ IFPUG has gained support and recognition by the world of software and systems engineering specialists. Relationships with colleagues and world renowned experts in the areas of SPICE/CMMI®, software and life cycle processes, software quality, etc. have put IFPUG and functional size measurement on the global radar – and that is good news for us all!

There are many other equally ambitious results we have achieved through ISO participation on your behalf. It has been a lot of work, but the results for IFPUG have been tremendous.
Requirements management standards: In May 2006, ISO approved several new work items related to requirements management standards. To my knowledge, these standards will be developed and then imposed on the software and systems engineering community worldwide without the benefit of IFPUG FP knowledgeable experts. It may serve the IFPUG membership to have a representative participate, at least in a reviewer capacity, on these emerging standards. Requirements management and articulation is one of the most promising areas for IFPUG today.

Functional (or Application) domains: I have been personally tasked to lead a study group to review the technical report I authored for ISO – Functional Domains for use with Functional Size Measurement – and whether the software industry supports the need to turn this into a full international standard. From my preliminary research, our industry has not actively or consistently defined software types (domains) and is in dire need of more formal definitions to describe the “type” of software being requested (and then sized with function points). Proponents of function point variants outside of IFPUG assert that different types of software need different ways of sizing, yet there is no common definition for the type of software variously described as military, process-control, or real-time. IFPUG would be ideally situated to participate in this project (if it becomes a new work item in May 2007) because of our expertise in ISO, ISBSG, software measurement, and functional size measurement.

Should IFPUG continue its collaboration with ISO? Make your opinion known!

Here are just a few of the emerging opportunities where IFPUG could potentially continue collaboration with ISO:

- **Software and systems Benchmarking Standards:** ISO recently approved the International Software Benchmarking Standards Group (ISBSG) for Category C liaison in anticipation of a potential Benchmarking Project. In addition, the COSMIC (common software measurement international consortium) representatives to ISO have not expressed any indication to discontinue ISO involvement. It may be in IFPUG’s best interests to participate in this project – especially since we have amassed considerable ISO political and technical expertise. A formal recommendation about the establishment of such a project will be presented by the Benchmarking Study Group chair, Mr. Pekka Forselius of Finland, in Moscow in May 2007. At that time, a formal new working group may be set up and it is anticipated that the representatives of other functional size measurement methods (Mark II from UK, COSMIC, NESMA from the Netherlands, and FiSMA from Finland) may participate to ensure their interests are met.

- **Requirements management standards:** In May 2006, ISO approved several new work items related to requirements management standards. To my knowledge, these standards will be developed and then imposed on the software and systems engineering community worldwide without the benefit of IFPUG FP knowledgeable experts. It may serve the IFPUG membership to have a representative participate, at least in a reviewer capacity, on these emerging standards. Requirements management and articulation is one of the most promising areas for IFPUG and functional size measurement today.

- **Functional (or Application) domains:** I have been personally tasked to lead a study group to review the technical report I authored for ISO – Functional Domains for use with Functional Size Measurement – and whether the software industry supports the need to turn this into a full international standard. From my preliminary research, our industry has not actively or consistently defined software types (domains) and is in dire need of more formal definitions to describe the “type” of software being requested (and then sized with function points). Proponents of function point variants outside of IFPUG assert that different types of software need different ways of sizing, yet there is no common definition for the type of software variously described as military, process-control, or real-time. IFPUG would be ideally situated to participate in this project (if it becomes a new work item in May 2007) because of our expertise in ISO, ISBSG, software measurement, and functional size measurement.

So, what do you think – should IFPUG continue its collaboration with ISO by providing resources to ISO software and systems engineering standardization projects? Without representation, IFPUG will not have an ear to the world of emerging software and systems engineering standards.

Does it matter to you or your company if IFPUG participates in ISO standards? If you don’t care, then this collaboration will end at the same time as the demise of WG12 in May 2007. Of course, we will still resubmit IFPUG 4.2 (unadjusted) standard as an updated PAS (Publicly Available Specification) regardless, but the ongoing relationship between IFPUG and ISO will terminate and there will be no involvement in the above ISO standards development by IFPUG representatives. However, if the ISO task force and IFPUG’s future participation in ISO is important to you or to your company – please send the IFPUG Board an email with the subject line: IFPUG ISO task force (email: IFPUG@IFPUG.org) and let the board know that you want the IFPUG – ISO collaboration to continue. (Please cc me at dekkers@qualityplustech.com).

It has been a pleasure to serve you, the IFPUG members, as one of your IFPUG ISO ambassadors. Thank you for your ongoing and enthusiastic support of our efforts!
Sizing It Up

This feature is yet another new section in IFPUG’s A World of Information Newsletter. This space 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.

A Note from Joe

Announced: Joe Schofield, CFPS, CSMS, . . . Has just become a SEI-Authorized Instructor for Introduction to the CMMI. As has been widely publicized, the CMMI(R) is not just about software, and Joe hopes to share his application of the CMMI from a personal setting at the next ISMA Conference in Las Vegas in September. "Amanda, Panda, and the CMMI" is his version of the story of his daughter’s recent acquisition of a puppy and the use of CMMI Process Areas and Generic Practices to establish a policy, requirements, validation criteria, pilot criteria, stakeholder interaction, and on and on. We can’t guarantee that Joe’s presentation will be selected by the Conference Committee, but we wish him well as his teaches about the CMMI, especially in more conventional areas of applications. As an additional note, the Management Reporting Committee on which Joe serves, plans to transition the Certified Software Measurement Specialist exam body of knowledge to more industry-recognized sources like the CMMI, PSM, GQM, and Balanced Scorecard. That transition will be complete in about a year.

Joe Schofield, Management Reporting Committee Chair

Multimedia Update

As you are probably aware, recently the IFPUG membership voted to freeze the current direction of multiple media counting rules and to get an independent party to conduct a new survey to fully discover IFPUG membership multiple media common practices. This motion passed, 79% to 21%.

The Board of Directors is currently working on a plan of action to implement the course of action set forth by the motion. There are three critical considerations we are keeping at the forefront of this plan:

- A communication strategy that makes sure the IFPUG community/stakeholders know what is going on and the current status of the project
- Transparency of the process, analysis, and results
- Well-rounded representation of all sides of the issue by forming a steering committee that will provide guidance to the independent organization conducting the study.

In parallel with this, the Board is attempting to get some clarification from ISO experts as to how the multimedia issue may or may not impact the status of IFPUG function points as an ISO standard. The Board will share any and all understanding it gains with the IFPUG community.

Thanks again to all who have participated in this critical discussion, and we encourage everyone to contribute in the future.

Have your own podcast relating to software measurement, estimation, or management? Want to spread the word? Let us know and we’ll help you get the word out! E-mail us at CMC@ifpug.org

Ian Brown, Director of Marketing and Communications

The MRC plans to start the transition of the CSMS exam body of knowledge to other industry standards this year...
International Function Point Users Group
191 Clarksville Road
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550
Phone: 609-799-4900
Fax: 609-799-7032
E-mail: ifpug@ifpug.org

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).

2007 International Software Measurement and Analysis (ISMA) Conference

Save the Date!
September 9 - 14, 2007
Flamingo Las Vegas Hotel

Join us for the premier software measurement conference!