



Managing Software Risks in Software Intensive Systems with Metrics and Measures

Robert A. Martin

30 January 2003



*The views expressed in this presentation are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the policies or position of The MITRE Corporation.
Editorial graphics © 1994-2002 Martin and Morrison, used with permission.*

MITRE

Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- **Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks**

0 Background

- **S/W Quality Risks**
- **Metrics and Measures**


0 Discussion

- **Components of a SW Risk Management Framework**
- **Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks**


0 Summary

- **Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage**
- **Transferring to Industry and Academia**

If, To Manage You Must Measure... How Do You Measure an Abstract Concept Like Software Risk?



One Method of Assessing Software Risks



MITRE

Looking Beyond Errors To Judge The Risks in Software

- 0 Traditionally, most software organizations have focused on:
 - Managing the initial development schedule
 - Managing the development costs
 - Providing desired initial functionality to users
- 0 Maintainability issues are frequently deferred until the product is fielded
- 0 Why should a look at risks focus on the long-term perspective?
 - Software outlives hardware
 - Tightening budgets motivating code re-use efforts
 - Decisions made early in development may mean the difference between updating code and re-engineering it

Historically, eighty cents out of every dollar spent on software goes toward maintenance.

Introduction:

MITRE's Software Risk Assessment Work

- 0 **Wanted a framework for assessing lifecycle quality issues**
- 0 **Desired a flexible methodology for assessing risks in s/w systems**
 - **Apply to any language, any platform, any architecture, ...**
 - **To be supported by a set of assessment technologies**
 - **Must be an objective s/w-centric profile of the risks**
- 0 **The resultant risk profiles have been used:**
 - **Selecting contractors based on quality of past efforts**
 - **Monitoring software quality during development**
 - **Identifying potential development process changes**
 - **Guiding future migration decisions**
- 0 **MITRE's framework, methods, and tools have been proven**
 - **> 100 Systems, ~ 51 million lines of code, >52 languages from a multitude of architectures (UNIX varieties, VMS, MVS, Windows, Macintosh)**
 - **Systems range from 4K to 6,254K lines of code -- average of 500K**

Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks

0 Background

- **S/W Quality Risks**

- Metrics and Measures

0 Discussion

- Components of a SW Risk Management Framework
- Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks

0 Summary


- Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage
- Transferring to Industry and Academia

Software Risks Impact on Quality Are Not Well Defined

- 0 Most will agree they want their systems to be reliable, maintainable, evolvable, portable, open, etc.
- 0 Most people can't agree on what, specifically, reliable, maintainable, evolvable, portable, open, etc. actually mean or how to measure such qualities for an arbitrary body of code
- 0 Commercial software tools and metrics provide insights into implementations but typically do not provide any sense of higher context for lifecycle issues

Our definition: A quality system minimizes the risks to the system


Developers Can Provide Plenty of Complications to a System's Software Risks



Establishing a Framework for Measuring Risks

- 0 **Many areas can help minimize a system's risks**
 - **Some are well studied and have full fledged disciplines, technologies, and examination methodologies in place**
 - **Specifically: requirements traceability, functional completeness, and system testability are well established areas of study**
- 0 **The other life-cycle risk areas have received less attention but have enormous potential for reducing the levels and types of risk in the systems fielded**
- 0 **Much to draw from:**
 - Rome Air Development Center work and others***
 - **McCall et al. in 1977**
 - **Bowen et al. in 1984**
 - **Kitchenham et al.'s ESPRIT REQUEST project, 1987 & 1989...**

There Are Several Frameworks for Evaluating and Monitoring S/W Quality Risks



Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks

0 Background

- S/W Quality Risks
- Metrics and Measures

0 Discussion

- Components of a SW Risk Management Framework
- Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks

0 Summary

- Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage
- Transferring to Industry and Academia

Targeted Attributes Of Our S/W Quality Risk Assessment Methodology

0 The assessment should be:

- repeatable (independent of the assessor(s))
- independent of language, architecture, platform
- “cheap” to perform
- not dependent on presence of “all” code
- provide detailed insight into the software risks
- software centric
- based on artifacts only
- examine all artifacts of the system
 - = source code (including scripts, data, ...)
 - = supporting documentation (both internal and external to the code) and standards
- leverage automation where-ever possible

Guiding Principles: Breadth, Depth, and Repeatability

- 0 The evaluation of each quality issue should have a specific scope and context as well as a defined scoring criteria
- 0 Define context for ratings (ideal, good, marginal, and fail)
 - limiting choices increases repeatability
- 0 Use a mixture of:
 - Hard metrics (cyclomatic complexity, flow complexity, ...)
 - Objective measures (type of information available, existence)
 - Subjective measures (use of white space, usefulness)
- 0 The Metrics and Objective Measures attributes can have a scope of all of the code of the system
- 0 The Measures which require cognitive reasoning need to be scoped more narrowly (7/7/7 per language)
- 0 Provide a software tools framework to guide and assist evaluators & provide context and control of the process

Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks

0 Background

- S/W Quality Risks
- Metrics and Measures

0 Discussion


- **Components of a SW Risk Management Framework**

- Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks


0 Summary

- Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage
- Transferring to Industry and Academia

Bridging the Gap between The Measurable and Unmeasurable





S/W Quality Risk Frameworks: Scope and Focus Can Differ



- requirements issues
 - testing issues


Test & Requirements Issues are Addressed - So We Focused on S/W Attribute Issues




- software attributes

MITRE

Methodology and Process: The Software Quality Assessment Exercise (SQAE™)





Putting the Pieces Together



Details: SQAETM Areas and Factors


0 Assess software against a defined set of quality areas:

- Portability
- Evolvability
- Maintainability
- Descriptiveness



0 Quality areas are based on a set of seven components:

- Consistency (15 attributes)
- Independence (8 attributes)
- Modularity (10 attributes)
- Documentation (16 attributes)
- Self Descriptiveness (11 attributes)
- Anomaly Control (5 attributes)
- Design Simplicity (11 attributes)



Details of the SQAETM

Quality Component Assessment Questions

Independence Independence comprises two broad groups; software system independence and machine independence. Here the issue is to not tie the system to any specific host environment which would make it difficult or impossible to migrate, evolve, or enhance the system.

| | <u>Proportion of Factor Value</u> |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Software System Independence</i> | |
| 2.1 - Does the software avoid all usage of specific pathnames/filenames? | (100) |
| 2.2 - Is the software free of machine, OS and vendor specific extensions? | (200) |
| 2.3 - Are system dependent functions, etc., in stand-alone modules (not embedded in the code)? | (200) |
| 2.4 - Are the languages and interface libraries selected standardized and portable? (i.e., ANSI...) | (200) |
| 2.5 - Does the software avoid the need for any unique compilation in order to run (e.g., a custom post processor to “tweak” the code to run on machine X)? | (100) |
| 2.6 - Is the generated code (i.e., GUI Builders) able to run without a specific support runtime component? | (100) |
| <i>Machine Independence</i> | |
| 2.7 - Is the data representation machine independent? | (200) |
| 2.8 - Are the commercial software components available on other platforms in the same level of functionality? | (200) |

Modularity Modularity consists of several facets which each support the concepts of organized separation of functions and minimizes un-noticed couplings between portions of the system.

| | <u>Proportion of Factor Value</u> |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 3.1 - Is the structure of the design hierarchical in a top-down design within tasking threads? | (200) |
| 3.2 - Do the functional groupings of units avoid calling units outside their functional area? | (150) |
| 3.3 - Are machine dependent and I/O functions isolated and encapsulated? | (150) |
| 3.4 - Are interpreted code bodies (shell scripts and 4GL scripts) protected from accidental or deliberate modification? | (150) |
| 3.5 - Do all functional procedures represent one function (one-to-one function mapping)? | (150) |
| 3.6 - Are all commercial software interfaces & APIs, other than GUI Builders, isolated and encapsulated? | (200) |
| 3.7 - Have symbolic constants been used in place of explicit ones? | (150) |
| 3.8 - Are symbolic constants defined in an isolated and centralized area? | (100) |
| 3.9 - Are all variables used exclusively for their declared purposes? | (150) |
| 3.10 - Has the code been structured to minimize coupling to global variables? | (100) |

Examples of Tools Used in Assessing Software Quality Risks

Code Quality Assessment Tools


```

avatar root 56: ls
avatar root 57: more osasand1
avatar root 45: sgrep -b
sgrep Version 1.2
Usage:
sgrep [-a] [-s] [-r]
where :
-a normal mode
      (this is the
      default)
-s summary mode
-v verbose mode
-r report unrec
      -B begin recur
      If this par
      directory is
      -f use the give
      -L use the give
      patfile file contains
      patterns do
      specified a
avatar root 47:

```


| TOTALS | FILES | LINES |
|--------------------|-------|--------|
| Binary_Files | 3 | 0 |
| Text_Files | 20 | 2884 |
| Ada_Bodies | 1034 | 44914 |
| Ada_Specs | 175 | 4972 |
| Assembly_Code | 1 | 47 |
| Awk_Scripts | 1 | 12 |
| COBOL_Files | 88 | 88532 |
| C++_Bodies | 30 | 4788 |
| C++_Headers | 22 | 302 |
| C_Bodies | 880 | 105308 |
| C_Headers | 556 | 15750 |
| Database_Text_Data | 27 | 1393 |
| DDL_Files | 50 | 10761 |
| FORTRAN_Files | 28 | 912 |
| FortPro_Files | 15 | 11370 |
| Informix_4GL | 238 | 22837 |
| Informix_EC_Code | 1 | 674 |
| JPL_Bodies | 240 | 87562 |
| Makefiles | 67 | 15890 |
| Obj-Link_Docs | 317 | 1578 |
| Pascal_Bodies | 31 | 8315 |
| SQL_Files | 492 | 5029 |
| Shell_Scripts | 4 | 1290 |
| Bitmaps | 28 | 6376 |
| X_Bitmap | 2 | 14 |

... many tools do not adequately address the use of commercial packages, or easily deal with multi-language applications, or help you correctly interpret their metrics.



MITRE

Mapping Quality Component Questions to Exercises



Details of the SQAE™ Framework

Exercise A The first exercise area concentrates on those activities that can be accomplished by examining the two largest functional areas of the code. The activities in this exercise are listed below.

1.10 Are the naming conventions consistent for functional groupings?

Examine the scheduling modules and one other large functional grouping and cross reference between them.

Rating will be either Ideal, Good, Marginal, or Failing. If at least one of the programmers is either consistent or uses distinguishable naming conventions (marginal), if he/she uses both (good), if all programmers do both (ideal).

2.2 Is the software free of machine, OS and vendor specific extensions?

Examine two large functional groupings of code and cross reference between them and system libraries and known vendor extensions.

Rating will be either Ideal, Good, Marginal, or Failing. Score ideal if no instances occur, good if such assumptions affect less than 10% of the packages, marginal for less than 50%, else failing.


2.3 Are system dependent functions, etc., in stand-alone modules (not embedded in the code)?

Examine all known instantiations OS and vendor specific dependencies for encapsulation/isolation.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. $1 - (\text{number of embedded dependencies} / \text{total number of dependencies})$



The Core of the Software Quality Assessment Methodology



Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks

0 Background

- S/W Quality Risks
- Metrics and Measures

0 Discussion

- Components of a SW Risk Management Framework
- Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks

0 Summary

- Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage
- Transferring to Industry and Academia

Modifications to the SQAETM to Deal with Object Oriented Design and Development (1 of 2)

Exercise A - The first exercise area concentrates on those activities that can be accomplished by examining two large functional areas of the code. The activities in this exercise are listed below.

~~3.1 Is the structure of the design hierarchical in a top down design within tasking threads?~~

~~Has the code been structured into cohesive classes?~~

~~LOCM~~

~~Lack of Cohesion in Methods~~

~~3.2 Do the functional groupings of units avoid calling units outside their functional area?~~

~~Has code been structured into classes to avoid excessive coupling between classes?~~

~~CBO~~

~~Coupling Between Objects~~

~~3.10 Has code been structured to minimize coupling to global variables?~~

~~Have classes been structured into methods to avoid having a large number of methods being invoked for each input message to a class object?~~

~~RFC~~

~~Response For a Class~~

For non-OO design/implementations

For OO design/implementations

~~Using the two large functional areas of the code from 1.10, run McCabe BattleMap, Refine, or another tool to produce structure chart. Examine.~~

~~Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. 1 for crisp hierarchy, .6 for discernible hierarchy, 0 if neither.~~

Using the two large functional areas from 1.10, examine the classes and count the number of method pairs whose similarity is 0 and those that are not 0.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. $1 - 20 * \text{the average ratio of for each class of the similar method pairs with 0 similarity minus those whose similarity is not 0.}$

~~Ignoring utility and encapsulated service calls, examine the structure chart from 5.1.~~

~~Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. 1 for strong isolation, .6 for generally isolated, 0 if neither.~~

Examine the modules from 1.10, and count the number of classes to which the different classes are coupled to other classes through methods and/or instance variables.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. $1 - 20 * \text{the average ratio of the classes in these modules coupled to other classes to total classes in the system.}$

~~Examine the modules from 1.10, using a variable utilization map (such as a Set-Use diagram) and calculate the ratio of global variables used versus the total number of variables used for each procedure.~~

~~Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. $1 - 20 * \text{the average ratio of global variables to total variables.}$~~

Examine the classes from the modules from 1.10, and count the number of methods that could be executed in response to a message received by an object of each class.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. $1 - 20 * \text{the average ratio of the methods in a class invoked by a message to the class to the total number of methods in the class.}$

Modifications to the SQAETM to Deal with Object Oriented Design and Development (2 of 2)

Exercise F - The sixth exercise area activities look over all of the code loaded for a variety of tasks. The activities in this exercise are listed below.

~~7.2 Is the source code of low complexity (e.g., McCabe Cyclomatic...)?~~

Are the classes of low complexity?

WMC

Weighted Methods Per Class

~~7.7 Is the code segmented into procedure bodies that can be understood easily?~~

Has code been organized into classes and sub-classes that can be understood easily?

NOC

Number of Children

~~7.9 Have all procedures been structured to avoid excessive nesting?~~

Have classes been structured to avoid large levels of inheritance?

DIT

Depth of Inheritance Tree of a Class

For non-OO design/implementations

~~Using the available source code, calculate the Cyclomatic complexity.~~

~~Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. Calculate the average Cyclomatic complexities and standard deviation for all functions and procedures. Score will be $1 - [(average + s.d. - 15) \times 0.02.]$~~

~~Using the available source code, examine the code.~~

~~Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. 1 for all procedure bodies are less than two pages @ 50 lines per page, .8 for 80% are less than two pages, .5 for 50% are less than two pages, and 0 otherwise.~~

~~Using the available source code, calculate the average and standard deviation of the nesting levels.~~

~~Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. Score will be the ratio of $13 / (average\ squared + one\ sigma\ squared)$ with a maximum score of 1~~

For OO design/implementations

Using the available code, examine the methods of each class and calculate the sum of the Cyclomatic complexities for each method in a class. Calculate the average and standard deviation of the class complexities.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. Score will be $1 - [(average + s.d. - 15) \times 0.02.]$

Using the available code, count the number of direct sub-classes for each class.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. $1 - 20 * \text{the average ratio of classes to the direct sub-classes.}$

Using the available code, calculate the length of the longest path of inheritance to each module. Calculate the average and standard deviation of the inheritance lengths.

Rating will be between 1 and 0, where 1 is the higher rating. Score will be $1 - [(average + s.d. - 15) \times 0.02.]$

Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks

0 Background

- S/W Quality Risks
- Metrics and Measures

0 Discussion


- Components of a SW Risk Management Framework
- Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks

0 Summary

- Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage
- Transferring to Industry and Academia

Having An Understanding Software Quality Risks Can Be Used In...


The Selection of Contractors



Reviews of SIW Releases for a Project Office



Selection of Migration Systems



Software Quality Assessment Uses

- 0 **Understanding the Software's quality can:**
 - **Allow for evaluation of a contractor based on quality of past products**
 - **Allow for in-progress corrections to a development effort**
 - **Guide future migration decisions**
 - **Provide for the rapid identification of the sources of risk**
 - =in understandable & actionable terms for mgmt
 - =in fine detail for the technologists
 - **Provide a broad review of the software lifecycle risks associated with multi-component systems**
 - **Allow risk comparisons for systems independent of language, platform, architecture, ...**
 - **Guide the build, buy, or re-use decisions**




Reporting the Results of a Software Quality Risk Assessment Exercise

Both a Software Quality Risk Assessment Report and (if desired) a Briefing version are available

The collage displays various components of a software quality assessment report. Key elements include:

- Program Risk Profiles:** A table listing risk categories and their associated metrics.
- Assessment Foundation:** A diagram showing the relationship between the assessment process and the underlying system.
- Examples of the Quality Component Assessment:** Detailed text and diagrams illustrating specific assessment scenarios.
- The Augmented SCE Software Quality Assessment Exercise Methodology:** A flowchart or diagram detailing the methodology used.
- Software Quality Assessment Areas:** A list of areas such as Reliability, Maintainability, and Design Simplicity.
- An Overview of the Evaluation Process and Methodology:** A high-level summary of the assessment process.
- Table of Contents:** A structured list of report sections, including Introduction, Objectives, and Assessment Results.
- Software Quality Assessment Exercise Report:** The main report title page, dated 29 February 1995, published by MITRE.

SQAE™ Foundation

| | Project A | Project B | ... Project CZ | Total of Projects |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| Source Code  | 112,000 LOC | 558,000 LOC | ... 58,000 LOC | 51,173,315 LOC |
| | Ada, C, Shell, TAE+, SQL, X, MOTIF, Stored Procedures | C, Shell, X, MOTIF | ... Ada, C, ELF, ezX, SQL, X, MOTIF | Ada, C, FORTRAN, COBOL, shell, TAE+, SQL, X, MOTIF, UIL, Stored Procedures, GEL, ELF, ezX, ... |
| Written Material  | Top Level Design Doc SDD | SDD SDP | ... Top Level Design Doc SPS SDD SDP | Top Level Design Doc SPS SDD SDP Case Tools Repositories |
| Reference Material  | Product Literature Reference Manual Users Manual | Design and Code Stnds | ... Product Literature Reference Manual Users Manual Design and Code Stnds | Product Literature Reference Manual Users Manual Design and Code Stnds |

This Chart Contains Representative Assessment Results

MITRE

SQAE™ Finding Examples: Mitigators, Drivers, & Other Observations

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Risk Mitigators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Naming conventions used for modules and variables helps understand the code's functionality. 0 Good use of white space and indention. 0 Modules are easily viewed at once (< 100 LOC) 0 Good functional documentation with high-level design. 0 Good design documentation, showing data and control flows. 0 Good developer documentation for supported APIs. 0 Good top-down hierarchical structure to code. 0 Modules use straightforward algorithms in a linear fashion. 0 System dependencies are to readily available COTS software. 0 Code is of low complexity. 0 Logic flow through individual procedures is easy to follow. 0 Disciplined coding standards followed by the programmers. 0 Considerable effort made to use POSIX calls throughout. 0 System dependencies platform or COTS are encapsulated. | <p>Risk Drivers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Level of isolation and encapsulation of dependencies on platform and COTS packages varies between programmers 0 Use of environmental variables is undocumented and inconsistently done 0 Lack of written standards for naming conventions, error handling, data definitions, etc 0 Lack of standards for naming conventions, error handling data definitions, I/O, etc 0 Design documentation is poorly organized, incomplete, and at a very high level 0 No low-level design information or functional allocation of software in documentation 0 Machine generated code documentation is inconsistent with the developed code documentation 0 Machine generated code is undocumented 0 Procedure and file names depend on path for uniqueness 0 Hard coded absolute filenames/paths used 0 UNIX commands hardcoded in the code 0 Hard coded variables used when symbolic constants should have been used 0 There are some machine dependent data representations 0 Code is not ANSI standard 0 Variables used for other than their declared purpose 0 No low-level control and task flows in documentation 0 No prologs for the majority of the modules 0 Inadequate indexing of documentation 0 Excessive use of global variables 0 Input error checking is not consistently applied 0 System dependent on a proprietary language for some functions related to integration with COTS 0 Lack of consistency in the code between programmers 0 No isolation or encapsulation of dependencies on platform or COTS 0 System tied to a proprietary language for procedural processing and data access 0 System is dependent on a proprietary run-time environment 0 Fourteen violations of one of the few company coding standards 0 Two percent of the code modules are overly large, more than 100 LOC |
| <p>Other Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 No documented method for other languages to call services 0 "Man pages" are out of date for some APIs 0 Number of modules may be excessive 0 COTS screen description files use standard X-Windows resource file formats 0 Proprietary language does not support data typing 0 In the vendor's proprietary language, variables are never explicitly declared (A typo will create a variable) 0 SQL is only used for ~10% of the code that accesses the database <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The rest uses the proprietary DBMS calls 0 Complete source code for gnu Perl was included as part of deliverable subsystem source code | |

This Chart Contains Representative Assessment Results

MITRE

Examples of Feedback

Application's Primary Strengths: Integrator Perspective

- 0 Isolation of dependencies
 - Effort has been made to segregate code so that actual processing algorithms are buffered from platform and COTS dependencies.
 - This buffering lowers the system's sensitivity to changes in its operating environment.
 - Should the platform change significantly (New Database, etc) code rewrites and unit tests split to distinct areas rather than rippling through

Application's Primary Weaknesses: Integrator Perspective


- 0 Descriptiveness
 - The provided documentation addresses aspects of the system only at the highest level and does not detail essential low level information:
 - = System dependencies
 - = Knowledge domains required for maintenance
 - = Input data tolerance and valid range of value definitions
 - = Specific data flow descriptions
 - = Policies for error handling
 - The code itself is poorly documented internally and makes frequent use of programming constructs which hinder readability and traceability

MITRE

This Chart Contains Representative Assessment Results


MITRE

Sample Assessment Results for Multiple Developers



| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Key | | |
| Data Series 1 = Reference | Data Series 4 = Prj 1 Vndr B | Data Series 7 = Prj 2 Vndr C |
| Data Series 2 = Prj 1 Vndr A | Data Series 5 = Prj 2 Vndr B | Data Series 8 = Mean & Range |
| Data Series 3 = Prj 2 Vndr A | Data Series 6 = Prj 1 Vndr C | of 40 Systems |

Examples of Software Quality Risk Profiles (3D)



This Chart Contains Representative Assessment Results

MITRE

Summary:

The Value of the SQAE™

- 0 Easy to learn and apply for experienced developers
- 0 Can provide an independent, objective assessment with community norms of key metrics for comparison of a project with the practices of its peers.
- 0 Follows a repeatable process
- 0 Provides specific detail findings
- 0 Minimal effort to accomplish (5 - 6 staff weeks per system)
 - How large the application is, the number of different languages used, and the type of assessment desired
 - A small level of additional effort is needed when we run into a language we have not previously encountered
- 0 Framework for comparing and contrasting systems
- 0 Provides mechanism for obtaining a “past performance” measure of contractors
- 0 Brings out lifecycle concerns and issues
- 0 Proven ability to adapt to technology changes and the changes in software development methodologies

Summary:

The Value of a SQAE™ (Concluded)

- 0 **Can be used as a pro-active framework for stating quality reqt's**
 - Many quality measures are easily restated as req'ts for coding & design stds
 - Can use as part of an award fee determination
 - SOW words to ensure Government has access to code and doc's
- 0 **A variety of Government customers have been interested in the continued application of our work**
 - Augmentation of the SEI SCE to look at product as well as process
 - Supports Air Force "supportability assessment" task
 - Helping compare and contrast legacy systems
- 0 **Assessments have been consistent with "other" opinions including the developer's**
- 0 **Can track assessed contractors through project milestones**
 - Comparing risk drivers and risk mitigators experienced vs. Software Quality Assessment risk profile

Discussion Outline

0 Introduction

- Managing S/W Quality Issues by Measuring Risks

0 Background

- S/W Quality Risks
- Metrics and Measures


0 Discussion

- Components of a SW Risk Management Framework
- Adapting to Handle OO Specific Risks


0 Summary

- Using SW Risk Assessments to Manage
- Transferring to Industry and Academia

Direct and Indirect Technology Transfers of SQAE™ Methods and Tools




Languages from Product Assessments By Percentage of Assessed LOC



100 Systems with approximately 51 Million Lines of Code Assessed

MITRE

SQAE™ Experience-Base



?'s


CONTACT INFO:

Robert A. Martin

781-271-3001

ramartin@mitre.org


Why Are We Interested In S/W Risk Anyway?




Software Quality Teams must do more than remove errors!

MITRE


So, the SQAe is Only One Example of the Risk Assessments that use Metrics and Measures




Metadata and Data Handling Quality Factors



A “Design Review-time” View of the SQAE



Augmented SCE: Implementation Schedule/Activities



| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Key: | - Initial Planning | - Review Submittals/Plan Sch. | - Process Assessment Visit | - Visit Findings Capture |
| | - Detailed Preparation Work | - Product Assessment | - Proposal Material Review | - Develop Report |
| | - IFPP Material Development | - General Information Feed | - Visit Preparation/Tailoring | - Products to Customer |