

COSYSMO 3.0: An Extended, Unified Cost Estimating Model For Systems Engineering

Sponsor: DASD(SE)

By

Dr James P Alstad

6th Annual SERC Doctoral Students Forum

November 7, 2018

FHI 360 CONFERENCE CENTER

1825 Connecticut Avenue NW

8th Floor

Washington, DC 20009

www.sercuarc.org




Agenda:





- **Preliminaries: motivation, history, research hypothesis, & methodology**
- **The priors; the COSYSMO 3.0 formula**
- **Closing: Developing the Final Model; future research**
- **Appendices: Bibliography; backup slides**

- **Context:**
 - **Current and future trends create challenges for full-system cost estimation**
 - Emergent requirements, rapid change, net-centric systems of systems, COTS, clouds, apps, widgets, high assurance with agility, multi-mission systems
 - **Current development practices can minimize cost of one phase, such as development, while raising full-system cost**
- **COSYSMO 3.0 is being developed to mitigate this situation by supporting accurate estimates of systems engineering costs, with benefits including:**
 - **Allowing thoughtful system-level systems engineering during development, which can result in, for example, choosing new technologies that reduce total system cost**
 - **Allowing thoughtful engineering of systems to support life-cycle flexibility**

Software Cost Models



Other Independent Estimation Models




Software Extensions


Legend:

Model has been calibrated with historical project data and expert (Delphi) data

Model is derived from COCOMO II


Model has been calibrated with expert (Delphi) data





- **It is possible to develop a systems engineering cost estimating model (“COSYSMO 3.0”) with these properties:**
 - **Is applicable to a wide range of systems engineering projects;**
 - **Includes all the major features of COSYSMO 1.0 and its extension models, except for interoperability;**
 - **Provides continuity to users of previous COSYSMO-family models;**
 - **When calibrated to data from a particular organization, estimates actual systems engineering costs with a PRED(.30) accuracy of 50%.**

Figure 4.1 from [22]



Agenda:

- **Preliminaries: motivation, history, research hypothesis, & methodology**
- **The priors; the COSYSMO 3.0 formula**
- **Closing: Developing the Final Model; future research**
- **Appendices: Bibliography; backup slides**



- I led COSYSMO 3.0 Wideband Delphi workshops at 4 conferences over the period August 2015-March 2016**
- **Purpose:** To develop consensus expert opinion on the numerical value of COSYSMO 3.0 parameters
 - **Delphi = anonymous voting; Wideband = group discussion**
 - **Protocol for a parameter:**
 - I state a starting value for a parameter
 - Each expert fills in a paper ballot with a recommended value
 - I collect ballots & announce average value
 - I lead a discussion; if there is not consensus, another round of voting is held
 - **Resulted in 26 expert ballots**
 - Experts represented 21 organizations
 - With 19.6 average years of SysEng experience
 - **Result was “Expert-Based COSYSMO 3.0”**

$$PH = A \cdot (AdjSize)^E \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{15} EM_j$$

Elements of the COSYSMO 3.0 model:

- **Calibration parameter A**
- **Adjusted Size model**
 - eReq submodel, where 4 products contribute to size
 - Reuse submodel
- **Exponent (E) model**
 - Accounts for diseconomy of scale
 - Constant and 3 scale factors
- **Effort multipliers EM**
 - 13 cost drivers

$$AdjSize_{C3} = \sum_{SizeDrivers} eReq(Type(SD), Difficulty(SD)) \times$$

$$PartialDevFactor(AL_{Start}(SD), AL_{End}(SD), RType(SD))$$

- ***SizeDriver* is one of the system engineering products that determines size in the COSYSMO family (per [2]). Any product of these types is included:**
 - System requirement
 - System interface
 - System algorithm
 - Operational scenario
- **There are two submodels:**
 - Equivalent nominal requirements (“eReq”)
 - Raw size
 - Partial development
 - Adjusts size for reuse

- The eReq submodel is unchanged from [2].
- The submodel computes the size of a *SizeDriver*, in units of eReq (“equivalent nominal requirements”)
- Each *SizeDriver* is evaluated as being easy, nominal, or difficult.
- The following table contains conversion factors for the conversion of a *SizeDriver* to a number of eReq:

Size Driver Type	Easy	Nominal	Difficult
System Requirement	0.5	1.0	4.5
System Interface	1.9	4.0	9.0
System Algorithm	1.9	3.8	9.8
Operational Scenario	6.4	13.6	26.3

Reuse operates in two directions [1]:

- **Development with reuse (DWR):** previously developed artifacts are reused on the current project
 - Addressed completely by the DWR partial development model
- **Development for reuse (DFR):** the current project is creating artifacts to be reused on other projects
 - One aspect of DFR development is that DFR costs more than ordinary development
 - Addressed by the DFR cost driver (covered there)
 - Another aspect of DFR is that the artifacts may be only partially completed, as during an IR&D project
 - Addressed by the DFR partial development model

Size Model – Partial Development Submodel

- (Concepts here are simplified a little)
- The basic DWR concept:
 - If a reused *SizeDriver* is being brought in, that saves effort, and so we adjust the size by multiplying the raw size by a *PartialDevFactor* less than 1.
 - The value of *PartialDevFactor* is based on the maturity of the reused *SizeDriver*, and is looked up in a table [24].
 - How fully developed was the *SizeDriver*?
 - If there is no reuse for this *SizeDriver*, then *PartialDevFactor* = 1 (no adjustment).

DWR Activity Level:	New	Design Modified	Design Implemented	Adapted for Integration	Adopted for Integration	Managed
DWR % for this AL through end	100.00%	83.00%	70.13%	56.88%	37.82%	17.50%

- The basic development-for-reuse (DFR) concept is analogous:

DFR Activity Level:	Conceptualized for Reuse	N/A	Designed for Reuse	Constructed for Reuse	N/A	Validated for Reuse
DFR % from start through this AL	31.96%		54.60%	78.06%		90.69%

- Exponent model is expanded from Peña [4, 9]

$$E = E_{Base} + SF_{ROR} + SF_{PC} + SF_{RV}$$


Where:

- E_{Base} = A minimum exponent for diseconomy of scale
- SF = scale factor
- ROR = Risk/Opportunity Resolution
- PC = Process Capability
- RV = Requirements Volatility

The effect of a large exponent is more pronounced on bigger projects

- Here are the 13 cost drivers:

	Driver Name	Data Item
UNDR	CONOPS & requirements understanding	Subjective assessment of the CONOPS & the system requirements
	Architecture understanding	Subjective assessment of the system architecture
	Stakeholder team cohesion	Subjective assessment of all stakeholders
CMPX	Level of service requirements	Subjective difficulty of satisfying the key performance parameters
	Technology risk	Maturity, readiness, and obsolescence of technology
	# of Recursive levels in the design	Number of applicable levels of the Work Breakdown Structure
OPRN	Development for reuse	Is this project developing artifacts for later reuse?
	# and Diversity of installations/platforms	Sites, installations, operating environment, and diverse platforms
	Migration complexity	Influence of legacy system (if applicable)
ENVR PERS	Personnel/team capability	Subjective assessment of the team's intellectual capability
	Personnel experience/continuity	Subjective assessment of staff consistency
	Multisite coordination	Location of stakeholders and coordination barriers
	Tool support	Subjective assessment of SE tools



The EMR (Effort Multiplier Ratio) of a cost driver is its maximum possible value divided by its minimum possible value; this is the impact of the cost driver.

Agenda:

- **Preliminaries: motivation, history, research hypothesis, & methodology**
- **The priors; the COSYSMO 3.0 formula**
- **Closing: Developing the Final Model; future research**
- **Appendices: Bibliography; backup slides**



- **I obtained a dataset of projects from an aerospace company**
 - Fit a model to that, using the Delphi results as Bayesian priors
 - The result is the Final Model of COSYSMO 3.0
- **Calibrating the model to the dataset and achieving $\text{PRED}(.30) \geq 50\%$ took some imagination**
 - A simple-minded fit resulted in either:
 - Some non-credible parameter values; or
 - $\text{PRED}(.30) < 50\%$.
 - I was able to calibrate by:
 - Dropping a few outliers; and
 - Using a hill-climbing algorithm to find suitable parameter values.

- **Future research topix:**
 - **Create a validated model for interoperability**
 - Existing COSYSMO 3.0 work provides an excellent foundation
 - **Create tailored models for different types of project**
 - “Tailored” = some driver values are pre-filled in
 - Defense, software-intensive, ...
 - **Estimating model for total development cost, based primarily on COSYSMO 3.0 drivers**
 - Some work already done at Lockheed-Martin
 - **Better integrate activity levels between DWR and DFR**

Agenda:

- **Preliminaries: motivation, history, research hypothesis, & methodology**
- **The priors; the COSYSMO 3.0 formula**
- **Closing: Developing the Final Model; future research**
- **Appendices: Bibliography; backup slides**



- 1. “A Generalized Systems Engineering Reuse Framework and its Cost Estimating Relationship”, Gan Wang, Garry J Roedler, Mauricio Pena, and Ricardo Valerdi, INCOSE 2014.**
- 2. “The Constructive Systems Engineering Cost Model (COSYSMO)”, Ricardo Valerdi (PhD Dissertation), 2005.**
- 3. “Estimating Systems Engineering Reuse with the Constructive Systems Engineering Cost Model (COSYSMO 2.0)”, Jared Fortune (PhD Dissertation), 2009.**
- 4. “Quantifying the Impact of Requirements Volatility on Systems Engineering Effort”, Mauricio Pena (PhD Dissertation), 2012.**
- 5. “Life Cycle Cost Modeling and Risk Assessment for 21st Century Enterprises”, Barry Boehm, Jo Ann Lane, Supannika Koolmanojwong, Richard Turner (presentation), April 29, 2014.**
- 6. "System Interoperability Influence on System of Systems Engineering Effort", Jo Ann Lane, Ricardo Valerdi, CSER 2011.**
- 7. “COSYSMO Extension as a Proxy Systems Cost Estimation” (presentation), Reggie Cole, Garry Roedler, October 23, 2013.**

- 8. “COSATMO: Developing Next-Generation Full-Coverage Cost Models” (presentation), Jim Alstad, USC CSSE Annual Research Review, April 29, 2014.**
- 9. "Quantifying the Impact of Requirements Volatility on Systems Engineering Effort" (presentation), Mauricio Peña, Ricardo Valerdi, October 18, 2012 (COCOMO Forum).**
- 10. “Cost Model Extensions to Support Systems Engineering Cost Estimation for Complex Systems and Systems of Systems”, Jo Ann Lane, CSER 2009.**
- 11. “Proposed Modification to COSYSMO Estimating Relationship”, Gan Wang, Ricardo Valerdi, Barry Boehm, Alex Shernoff, INCOSE 2008.**
- 12. “Towards COSYSMO 3.0”, revised PowerPoint presentation by Gan Wang (filename is “COSYSMO 3.0 Definition Outline.Rev.pptx”), May 2015.**
- 13. “COSATMO: Presenting the Harmonized COSYSMO 3.0 Model” (presentation), Jim Alstad, October 22, 2014 (COCOMO Forum).**

- 14.** “Towards COSYSMO 3.0”, 3rd revision of PowerPoint presentation by Gan Wang (revises [12]) (filename is “COSYSMO 3.0 Definition Outline.Rev3.pptx”), June 2015.
- 15.** “C4ISR Architecture Working Group Final Report - Levels of Information System Interoperability (LISI)”, Department of Defense, Washington DC: OSD(ASD(C3I)) C4ISR AWG, 1998.
- 16.** “The Levels of Conceptual Interoperability Model”, Tolk, A., and Muguira, J., Proceedings of the 2003 Fall Simulation Interoperability Workshop. Orlando FL, September 2003.
- 17.** “Towards a Holistic, Total Engineering Cost Model”, Wang, G., Shernoff, A., Turnidge, J., and Valerdi, R., INCOSE Singapore, July 2009.
- 18.** “COSYSMO Reuse Extension”, Wang, G., Valerdi, R., Ankrum, A., Millar, C., and Roedler, G., INCOSE Utrecht, June 2008.
- 19.** “COSATMO: Presenting the Harmonized COSYSMO 3.0 Model” (presentation), Jim Alstad, October 22, 2014 (COCOMO Forum)

- 20.** “A Survey on Interoperability Measurement.” Ford, T., Colombi, J., Graham, S., and Jacques, D., Twelfth International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium (12th ICCRTS), Newport, RI, June 19-21 2007.
- 21.** “A Framework For Intelligent Assessment and Resolution of Commercial-Off-The-Shelf Product Incompatibilities”, Bhuta, Jesal (PhD Dissertation), 2007.
- 22.** “Software Engineering Economics” Boehm, Barry W., Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River NJ, 1981.
- 23.** “The Incremental Commitment Spiral Model”, Boehm, B., Lane, J., Koolmanojwong, S., Turner, R., Addison-Wesley, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2014.
- 24.** “The Generalized Reuse Framework—Strategies and the Decision Process for Planned Reuse”, Wang, G., INCOSE SEDC16.
- 25.** “Systems and Software Engineering—Life Cycle Management—Part 1: Guide for Life Cycle Management”, ISO/IEC TR 24748-1:2010(E).

- 26.** “Guide to the Systems Engineering Body of Knowledge (SEBoK)” version 1.5.1, SEBoK Authors, The Trustees of the Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken NJ, 18 December 2015, <http://sebokwiki.org/wiki/>.
- 27.** “System Verification” page in [26] <http://sebokwiki.org/w/index.php?title=System_Verification&oldid=50858>, 16 June 2015 13:52.
- 28.** “Assessing Systems Engineering Effectiveness in Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAPs) (Final Technical Report (A013), SERC Technical Task Order TO001)”, Boehm, B., Ingold, D., et al, Systems Engineering Research Center, September 30, 2009.
- 29.** “Proposed Modification to COSYSMO Estimating Relationship”, Wang, Gan, Boehm, Barry, Valerdi, Ricardo, Shernoff, Alex, INCOSE International Symposium, June 2008, Vol.18(1), pp.249-262.

- **Example parameter definition**
- **Numerical parameters of the Final Model**
- **Placing Process Capability: cost driver or scale factor?**
- **Continuity and the Rosetta Stone**
- **Coordination with COCOMO III**

Definition

- **Text definition:** Is the project (or subproject) developing artifacts to be reused on later project(s)? (“Development for Reuse”, or “DFR”.) If so, what is the extent of the planned reuse?
- **Rating scale:**

Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
No reuse at all.	Artifacts will be reused only on the current project.	Artifacts will be reused across the program.	Artifacts will be reused across a product line.	Artifacts will be reused across multiple product lines.

Text Rating:		Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Numeric Rating:		-2.0	-1.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0
Cost Driver	Step Size	Effort Multipliers					
CONOPS & Requirements Understanding	0.765	1.71	1.31	1.00	0.76	0.59	(Invalid)
Architecture Understanding	0.805	1.54	1.24	1.00	0.81	0.65	(Invalid)
Stakeholder Team Cohesion	0.802	1.55	1.25	1.00	0.80	0.64	(Invalid)
Level of Service Requirements	1.277	0.61	0.78	1.00	1.28	1.63	(Invalid)
Technology Risk	1.262	0.63	0.79	1.00	1.26	1.59	(Invalid)
# of Recursive Levels in the Design	1.179	0.72	0.85	1.00	1.18	1.39	(Invalid)
# and Diversity of Installations/ Platforms	1.238	(Invalid)	(Invalid)	1.00	1.24	1.53	1.90
Migration Complexity	1.252	(Invalid)	(Invalid)	1.00	1.25	1.57	1.96
Personnel/Team Capability	0.831	1.45	1.20	1.00	0.83	0.69	(Invalid)
Personnel Experience/ Continuity	0.858	1.36	1.17	1.00	0.86	0.74	(Invalid)
Multisite Coordination	0.812	1.52	1.23	1.00	0.81	0.66	0.54
Tool Support	0.892	1.26	1.12	1.00	0.89	0.80	(Invalid)
Scale Factor	Step Size	Scale Factor Values					
Risk & Opportunity Management	-0.0120	0.0602	0.0482	0.0361	0.0241	0.0120	0.0000
Process Capability	-0.0107	0.0536	0.0429	0.0322	0.0214	0.0107	0.0000
Requirements Volatility	0.0095	0.0000	0.0095	0.0189	0.0284	0.0379	(Invalid)

A	Productivity Factor	26.33
EBase	Exponent Base	1.0332

- **Process Capability (PROC) was a cost driver in COSYSMO 1.0, but there were arguments that it should be a scale factor instead**
- **With an earlier version of the model, I generated this table:**

	PROC as CD	PROC as SF
Cost Driver Fit		
Standard Error of Residuals	0.4829	0.4994
R squared	0.9890	0.9882
F-statistic	570.80	571.20
Scale Factor Fit		
Standard Error of Residuals	0.3985	0.1930
R squared	0.9911	0.9979
F-statistic	3946	11280

- **One argument in favor of “scale factor” is that its cost driver fit is only slightly worse, but its scale factor fit is much better**

- **A second argument is that members of the Working Group have the intuition that “scale factor” is likely correct, as a poor process would have a proportionally greater impact on a larger project**
- **A third argument is that “scale factor” would agree with its placement in COCOMO II**

- **Users of previous versions of COSYSMO want to carry forward as much of their estimation database as possible (“continuity”). So support is provided via a Rosetta Stone document which provides instructions on how to re-rate existing drivers under COSYSMO 3.0.**

Degree of Definition Change	Rosetta Stone Instruction for How To Change Old Rating
No change	“No change”
Moderate change	“No change”
Substantial change	“Decrement old rating by x steps”

Element Type Key:

CD = Cost Driver

SF = Scale Factor

Color (Degree of Change) Key:

No Change in Definition

No Change in Rating

Rating Change

New or Deleted

Element from COSYSMO 1.0 (or other model as shown)	COSYSMO 3.0 Element	Instructions for 3.0 Rating	Justification (for Working Group members)
CD: Requirements Understanding	CD: CONOPS and Requirements Understanding	Same rating.	1.0 CD is now a viewpoint in a larger 3.0 CD; the 1.0 rating should be carried forward in that context, without any mis-rating.
CD: Documentation Match to Life Cycle Needs	Dropped		
CD: # and Diversity of Installations/Platforms	(same)	Same rating.	Same definition.
CD: Personnel/Team Capability	(same)	Same rating.	Minor text definition improvement should allow the 1.0 rating to carry forward to a 3.0 rating.
CD: Process Capability	(same)	Same rating.	Same definition.
CD: Personnel Experience/Continuity	(same)	Decrement old rating by half a level.	One of two viewpoints has been "shifted up" one level; e.g., 3 years' experience was Nominal, but in 3.0 it's Low.
CD: Multisite Coordination	(same)	Same rating.	Same definition.
CD: Tool Support	(same)	Decrement old rating by a level.	The rating scale has been "shifted up" one level; e.g., "Strong, mature tools" was rated High, but in 3.0 it's Nominal. In addition, the topic of life cycle coverage was added to the rating scale. Decrementation by a level should not result in a significant mis-rating.

The Final Model has been coordinated with Brad Clark's in-progress COCOMO III definition effort, with these results:

- **Essentially identical definitions of Risk/Opportunity Management scale factor.**
- **Essentially identical definitions of Multi-Site Development cost driver.**
- **COSYSMO 3.0 Development for Reuse cost driver taken from COCOMO II.**
- **COSYSMO 3.0 Personnel/Team Capability cost driver definition modified to agree with COCOMO II's.**

- **A 2012 paper* was published distinguishing the scopes of COCOMO and COSYSMO in a project; Brad and the COSYSMO 3.0 Working Group coordinated on a update (“COCOMO – COSYSMO Estimation Boundaries” (working paper))**

***Wang, G., Valerdi, R., Roedler, G., Ankrum, A., Gaffney, J. E., “Harmonizing Systems and Software Cost Estimation,” International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing, Volume 25, 2012 - Issue 4-5: Special Issue: Through Life Cost Estimating.**