

Case Example 5:

Software Methodologies

The example here illustrates the differences in schedules, costs, and quality for three of these methodologies: Agile, Waterfall, and the combination of Team Software Process (TSP) and Personal Software Process (PSP) both of which were developed by Watts Humphrey of the Software Engineering Institute (SEI). TSP/PSP are normally used together.

For a detailed analysis of methodologies, see [Quantitative Comparison of 60 Software Development Methodologies](#), Capers Jones, published in July of 2017 by CRC Press.

Example 5: How Software Risk Master (SRM) Evaluates Software Methodologies					
	Java Language for all 3 Cases				
	1000 function points for all 3 Cases				
	\$7.500 per month for all 3 Cases				
	SRM can evaluate 60 methodologies including hybrid in 2017				
	New methodologies added when data becomes available				
	SRM also evaluates 5 levels of capability maturity model integrated (CMMI)				
	2017 is the 30th anniversary of IFPUG function point metrics				
		Waterfall	Agile	TSP/PSP	TSP = team software process
		CMMI 1	CMMI 0	CMMI 5	PSP = personal software process
Project Risks					
					Risks vary among methodologies
Cancellation		19.98%	14.19%	11.59%	
Negative ROI		25.31%	18.00%	14.68%	
Cost overrun		21.98%	15.90%	12.75%	
Schedule slip		26.64%	19.30%	15.45%	
Unhappy customers		15.98%	12.30%	9.27%	
Litigation		8.79%	6.26%	5.10%	
Technical debt/high COQ		22.46%	16.00%	13.03%	
Cyber attacks		13.69%	9.75%	7.94%	
Financial Risk		29.48%	21.00%	17.10%	
High warranty repairs		20.71%	14.75%	12.01%	

Poor maintainability		15.44%	11.00%	8.96%		
RISK AVERAGE		20.04%	14.40%	11.63%	Quality strong methodologies have lower risks	
Total Defects in Application		6,000	4,800	2,700	Agile, waterfall are not "quality strong" methodologies	
					TSP/PSP are "quality strong" methodologies	
Pre-Test Defect Removal %		45.00%	69.75%	81.00%		
Defects Removed		2,700	3,348	2,187		
Defects Remaining		3,300	1,452	513		
Joint Application Design (JAD)		No	Yes	Maybe		
Scrum sessions		No	Yes	Maybe		
Informal reviews		Yes	Yes	No		
Quality function deployment (QFD)		No	No	Yes		
Six Sigma for software		No	No	Maybe		
Requirements inspection		No	No	Yes	DRE goes up with inspections	
Design inspection		No	No	Yes		
Code inspection		No	No	Yes		
Test material inspection		No	Maybe	Yes		
Static analysis		No	Maybe	Yes	DRE goes up with static analysis	

Test Defect Removal %		70.00%	81.90%	87.50%		
Defects Removed		2,310	1,189	449		
Defects Remaining		990	263	64		
Unit test		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Function test		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Regression test		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Performance test		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Component test		No	No	Yes		
System test		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Acceptance/Beta test		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Bad fix injection %		9%	5%	4%	Bad-fix injection is low with quality-strong methodologies	
Bad fixes (new bugs in repairs)		89	13	3		
Defects detected but not repaired						
prior to delivery to customers		289	107	22	Unrepaired defects are low with quality-strong methodologies	
Cumulative Defect Removal %		78.69%	92.30%	96.79%	All projects should top 96% defect removal efficiency (DRE)	
					DRE developed by IBM circa 1973	
Total Defects Removed		4,721	4,430	2,613		

Total Defects Delivered		1,079	276	67	
High-Severity Defects Delivered		270	55	11	
Security Flaws Delivered		36	7	1	
Average monthly cost		\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500	
OVERALL PROJECT					
Development Schedule (months)		15.85	11.82	12.02	
Staff (technical + management)		10	7	7	
Development Effort (staff months)		158	84	86	
Development Costs		\$1,188,670	\$633,043	\$644,070	
DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES					
Requirements Effort (staff months)		15.85	7.17	8.59	
Design effort (staff months)		31.70	13.50	11.16	
Coding effort (staff months)		31.70	21.95	20.61	
Testing effort (staff months)		45.96	25.32	27.48	
Documentation effort (staff month)		12.68	6.75	6.87	
Management effort (staff months)		19.81	9.28	11.16	
TOTAL EFFORT (Staff months)		157.70	83.98	85.88	

10	Model-driven development			
	Good Quality (Quality strong)			
11	Clean room development			
12	Team software process (TSP) + PSP			
13	Feature driven (FDD)			
14	Personal software process (PSP)			
15	Specifications by Example			
16	CMMI development			
17	Micro service development			
18	Evolutionary Development (EVO)			
19	Rational Unified Process (RUP) from IBM			
20	Prototypes - disposable			
21	Open-source development			
22	Object Oriented (OO) development			
23	Global 24 hour development			
24	Disciplined agile delivery (DAD)			
25	Product Line engineering			
26	Service-Oriented modeling			
27	Mashup development			
	Average quality			
28	Prototypes - evolutionary			
28	Information engineering (IE)			
29	Crystal development			
30	Extreme programming (XP)			
31	Pair programming development			
32	Lean development			
33	Microsoft solutions			
34	Spiral development			
35	GIT development			
36	Legacy renovation			
37	Legacy replacement development			
38	Iterative development			
39	Test-driven development (TDD)			
40	CASE development			

41	Hybrid (agile + waterfall)			
42	Agile + scrum			
43	Legacy repair development			
44	Structured development			
45	Continuous development			
46	Dynamic system development method (DSDM)			
	Poor quality			
47	DevOps development			
48	Legacy data mining			
49	Prince 2 development			
50	Merise development			
51	Agile/Scrum			
52	Rapid application development (RAD)			
53	Reverse engineering			
54	V-Model development			
55	Reengineering			
56	Cowboy development			
57	ERP modification development			
58	Waterfall development			
59	COTS Modifications			
60	Anti patterns			