

▶ POLITECNICO DI MILANO

Dipartimento di
Elettronica e Informazione

Session 4

WBS, Estimation & Scheduling

Emanuele Della Valle

<http://home.dei.polimi.it/dellavalle>

- This slides are largely based on Prof. John Musser class notes on “Principles of Software Project Management”
- Original slides are available at <http://www.projectreference.com/>
- Reuse and republish permission was granted

- Review Session 3
- Work Breakdown Structures (WBS)
- Estimation
- *Network Fundamentals*
- *PERT & CPM Techniques*
- *Gantt Charts*
- *This slide set will likely roll-over to next week*

- Full Lifecycle
 - Know your pure waterfall, 7 phase model
 - Understand the steps in each phase
 - Know the primary issues and goals of each
- Methodologies
 - Know a representative sample
 - Waterfall and variation, 1-2 iterative ones
 - Learn a bit about XP and other Agile methods
- Planning (introduction)
 - Primary Planning Steps
 - Documents

- “Predictions are hard, especially about the future”,
Yogi Berra
- 2 Types: Lucky or Lousy?

- What's the difference?
- Plan: Identify activities. No specific start and end dates.
- Estimating: Determining the size & duration of activities.
- Schedule: Adds specific start and end dates, relationships, and resources.

- Set goal and scope
- Select lifecycle
- Set org./team form
- Start team selection
- Determine risks
- Create WBS
- Identify tasks
- Estimate size
- Estimate effort
- Identify task dependencies
- Assign resources
- Schedule work


How To Schedule

1. Identify “what” needs to be done
 - Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)
2. Identify “how much” (the size)
 - Size estimation techniques
3. Identify the dependency between tasks
 - Dependency graph, network diagram
4. Estimate total duration of the work to be done
 - The actual schedule

- How did you feel when I asked
 - “How long will your project take?”
- Not an easy answer to give right?
- At least not if I were a real customer on a real project
- How can you manage that issue?

- You need to decompose your project into manageable chunks
- ALL projects need this step
- Divide & Conquer
- Two main causes of project failure
 - Forgetting something critical
 - Ballpark estimates become targets
- How does partitioning help this?


- A Project: functions, activities, tasks




- Hierarchical list of project's work activities
- 2 Formats
 - Outline (indented format)
 - Graphical Tree (Organizational Chart)
- Uses a decimal numbering system
 - Ex: 3.1.5
- Includes
 - Development, Mgmt., and project support tasks
- Shows "is contained in" relationships
- Does not show dependencies or durations

- Contract WBS (CWBS)
 - First 2 or 3 levels
 - High-level tracking
- Project WBS (PWBS)
 - Defined by PM and team members
 - Tasks tied to deliverables
 - Lowest level tracking

- Up to six levels (3-6 usually) such as



- Upper 3 can be used by customer for reporting (if part of RFP/RFQ)
- Different level can be applied to different uses
 - Ex: Level 1: authorizations; 2: budgets; 3: schedules



Retail Web Site

1.0 Project Management

2.0 Requirements Gathering

3.0 Analysis & Design

4.0 Site Software Development

4.1 HTML Design and Creation

4.2 Backend Software

4.2.1 Database Implementation

4.2.2 Middleware Development

4.2.3 Security Subsystems

4.2.4 Catalog Engine


4.2.5 Transaction Processing


4.3 Graphics and Interface


4.4 Content Creation


5.0 Testing and Production

- Process WBS
 - a.k.a Activity-oriented
 - Ex: Requirements, Analysis, Design, Testing
 - Typically used by PM
- Product WBS
 - a.k.a. Entity-oriented
 - Ex: Financial engine, Interface system, DB
 - Typically used by engineering manager
- Hybrid WBS: both above
 - This is not unusual
 - Ex: Lifecycle phases at high level with component or feature-specifics within phases
 - Rationale: processes produce products









- Organizational WBS
 - Research, Product Design, Engineering, Operations
 - Can be useful for highly cross-functional projects

- Geographical WBS
 - Can be useful with distributed teams
 - NYC team, San Jose team, Off-shore team

- Generic term for discrete tasks with definable end results
- Typically the “leaves” on the tree
- The “one-to-two” rule
 - Often at: 1 or 2 persons for 1 or 2 weeks
- Basis for monitoring and reporting progress
 - Can be tied to budget items (charge numbers)
 - Resources (personnel) assigned
- Ideally shorter rather than longer
 - Longer makes in-progress estimates needed
 - These are more subjective than “done”
 - 2-3 weeks maximum for software projects
 - 1 day minimum (occasionally a half day)
 - Not so small as to micro-manage

- List of Activities, not Things
- List of items can come from many sources
 - SOW, Proposal, brainstorming, stakeholders, team
- Describe activities using “bullet language”
 - Meaningful but terse labels
- All WBS paths do not have to go to the same level
- Do not plan more detail than you can manage

- PM must map activities to chosen lifecycle
- Each lifecycle has different sets of activities
- Integral process activities occur for all
 - Planning, configuration, testing
- Operations and maintenance phases are not normally in plan (considered post-project)
- Some models are “straightened” for WBS
 - Spiral and other iterative models
 - Linear sequence several times
- Deliverables of tasks vary by chosen lifecycle

- Top-Down
- Bottom-Up
- Analogy
- Brainstorming
 - Post-its on a wall
- Rolling Wave
 - 1st pass: go 1-3 levels deep
 - Gather more requirements or data
 - Add more detail later

- Start at highest level
- Systematically develop increasing level of detail
- Best if
 - The problem is well understood
 - Technology and methodology are not new
 - This is similar to an earlier project or problem
- But is also applied in majority of situations

- Start at lowest level tasks
- Aggregate into summaries and higher levels
- Cons
 - Time consuming
 - Needs more requirements complete
- Pros
 - Detailed

- Base WBS upon that of a “similar” project
- Use a template
- Analogy also can be estimation basis
- Pros
 - Based on past actual experience
- Cons
 - Needs comparable project

- Approach
 - Generate all activities you can think of that need to be done
 - Group them into categories
- Both Top-down and Brainstorming can be used on the same WBS
- Remember to get the people who will be doing the work involved (buy-in matters!)

- Network scheduling
- Costing
- Risk analysis
- Organizational structure
- Control
- Measurement

- Should be easy to understand
- Some companies have corporate standards for these schemes
- Some top-level items, like Project Mgmt. are in WBS for each project
 - Others vary by project
- What often hurts most is what's missing
- Break down until you can generate accurate time & cost estimates
- Ensure each element corresponds to a deliverable

- How detailed should it be?
 - Not as detailed as the final MS-Project plan
 - Each level should have no more than 7 items
 - It can evolve over time
- What tool should you use?
 - Excel, Word, Project
 - Org chart diagramming tool (Visio, etc)
 - Specialized commercial apps
- Re-use a “template” if you have one


- Very difficult to do, but needed often
- Created, used or refined during
 - Strategic planning
 - Feasibility study and/or SOW
 - Proposals
 - Vendor and sub-contractor evaluation
 - Project planning (iteratively)
- Basic process
 - Estimate the size of the product
 - Estimate the effort (man-months)
 - Estimate the schedule
 - NOTE: Not all of these steps are always explicitly performed

- Remember, an “exact estimate” is an oxymoron
- Estimate how long will it take you to get home from class tonight
 - On what basis did you do that?
 - Experience right?
 - Likely as an “average” probability
 - For most software projects there is no such ‘average’
- Most software estimations are off by 25-100%

Target vs. Committed Dates

- Target:
 - Proposed by business or marketing
 - Do not commit to this too soon!

- Committed:
 - Team agrees to this
 - After you've developed a schedule



Copyright 1998 Steven C. McConnell. Reprinted with permission from *Software Project Survival Guide* (Microsoft Press, 1998).

- Small projects (10-99 FPs), variance of 7% from post-requirements estimates
- Medium (100-999 FPs), 22% variance
- Large (1000-9999 FPs) 38% variance
- Very large (> 10K FPs) 51% variance

- Top-down
- Bottom-up
- Analogy
- Expert Judgment
- Priced to Win
- Parametric or Algorithmic Method
 - Using formulas and equations

- Based on overall characteristics of project
 - Some of the others can be “types” of top-down (Analogy, Expert Judgment, and Algorithmic methods)
- Advantages
 - Easy to calculate
 - Effective early on (like initial cost estimates)
- Disadvantages
 - Some models are questionable or may not fit
 - Less accurate because it doesn't look at details

- Create WBS
- Add from the bottom-up
- Advantages
 - Works well if activities well understood
- Disadvantages
 - Specific activities not always known
 - More time consuming

- Use somebody who has recent experience on a similar project
- You get a “guesstimate”
- Accuracy depends on their ‘real’ expertise
- Comparable application(s) must be accurately chosen
 - Systematic
- Can use a weighted-average of opinions

- Use past project
 - Must be sufficiently similar (technology, type, organization)
 - Find comparable attributes (ex: # of inputs/outputs)
 - Can create a function

- Advantages
 - Based on actual historical data

- Disadvantages
 - Difficulty 'matching' project types
 - Prior data may have been mis-measured
 - How to measure differences – no two exactly same

- Just follow other estimates
- Save on doing full estimate
- Needs information on other estimates (or prices)
- Purchaser must closely watch trade-offs
- Priced to lose?

- Lines of Code (LOC)
- Function points
- Feature points or object points
- Other possible
 - Number of bubbles on a DFD
 - Number of of ERD entities
 - Number of processes on a structure chart
- LOC and function points most common
 - (of the algorithmic approaches)
- Majority of projects use none of the above

- LOC Advantages
 - Commonly understood metric
 - Permits specific comparison
 - Actuals easily measured

- LOC Disadvantages
 - Difficult to estimate early in cycle
 - Counts vary by language
 - Many costs not considered (ex: requirements)
 - Programmers may be rewarded based on this
 - Can use: # defects/# LOC
 - Code generators produce excess code

- How do you know how many in advance?
- What about different languages?
- What about programmer style?
- Stat: avg. programmer productivity: 3,000 LOC/yr
- Most algorithmic approaches are more effective after requirements (or have to be after)

- Software size measured by number & complexity of functions it performs
- More methodical than LOC counts
- House analogy
 - House's Square Feet \sim = Software LOC
 - # Bedrooms & Baths \sim = Function points
 - Former is size only, latter is size & function
- Three basic steps

1. Count # of biz functions per category
 - Categories: outputs, inputs, db inquiries, files or data structures, and interfaces
2. Establish Complexity Factor for each and apply
 - Simple, Average, Complex
 - Set a weighting multiplier for each (0->15)
 - This results in the “unadjusted function-point total”
3. Compute an “influence multiplier” and apply
 - It ranges from 0.65 to 1.35; is based on 14 factors
4. Results in “function point total”
 - This can be used in comparative estimates

- Group consensus approach
- Rand corp. (<http://www.rand.org/>) used orig. Delphi approach to predict future technologies
- Present experts with a problem and response form
- Conduct group discussion, collect anonymous opinions, then feedback
- Conduct another discussion & iterate until consensus
- Advantages
 - Easy, inexpensive, utilizes expertise of several people
 - Does not require historical data
- Disadvantages
 - Difficult to repeat
 - May fail to reach consensus, reach wrong one, or all may have same bias

- Remember: most projects you'll run into don't use these
- Which is 'normal', so don't be surprised
 - Or come-in to new job and say "Hey, let's use COCOMO"
- These are more effective on large projects
 - Where a past historical base exists
- Primary issue for most projects are
 - Lack of similar projects
 - Thus lack of comparable data
- Catch-22: how to get started
 - See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catch-22_\(logic\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catch-22_(logic))

- Does not come for free
- Code types: New, Modified, Reused
- If code is more than 50% modified, it's "new"
- Reuse factors have wide range
 - Reused code takes 30% effort of new
 - Modified is 60% of new
- Integration effort with reused code almost as expensive as with new code

- Now that you know the “size”, determine the “effort” needed to build it
- Various models: empirical, mathematical, subjective
- Expressed in units of duration
 - Person-Months

- McConnell shows schedule tables for conversion of size to effort
- As with parametric size estimation, these techniques perform better with historical data
- Again, not seen in 'average' projects
- Often the size and effort estimation steps are combined (not that this is recommended, but is what often is done)
- "Commitment-Based" Scheduling is what is often done
 - Ask developer to 'commit' to an estimate (his or her own)

- CONstructive COSt MOdel
- Allows for the type of application, size, and “Cost Drivers”
- Outputs in Person Months
- Cost drivers using High/Med/Low & include
 - Motivation
 - Ability of team
 - Application experience
- Biggest weakness?
 - Requires input of a product size estimate in LOC

- Quality estimations needed early but information is limited
- Precise estimation data available at end but not needed
 - Or is it? What about the next project?
- Best estimates are based on past experience
- Politics of estimation:
 - You may anticipate a “cut” by upper management
- For many software projects there is little or none
 - Technologies change
 - Historical data unavailable
 - Wide variance in project experiences/types
 - Subjective nature of software estimation

- Over estimation issues
 - The project will not be funded
 - Conservative estimates guaranteeing 100% success may mean funding probability of zero.
 - Parkinson's Law: Work expands to take the time allowed
 - Danger of feature and scope creep
 - Be aware of "double-padding": team member + manager

- Under estimation issues
 - Quality issues (short changing key phases like testing)
 - Inability to meet deadlines
 - Morale and other team motivation issues

- Estimate iteratively!
 - Process of gradual refinement
 - Make your best estimates at each planning stage
 - Refine estimates and adjust plans iteratively
 - Plans and decisions can be refined in response
 - Balance: too many revisions vs. too few

- Are they 'Real Deadlines'?
 - Tied to an external event
 - Have to be met for project to be a success
 - Ex: end of financial year, contractual deadline, Y2K

- Or 'Artificial Deadlines'?
 - Set by arbitrary authority
 - May have some flexibility (if pushed)

- How you present the estimation can have huge impact
- Techniques
 - Plus-or-minus qualifiers
 - 6 months +/-1 month
 - Ranges
 - 6-8 months
 - Risk Quantification
 - +/- with added information
 - +1 month of new tools not working as expected
 - -2 weeks for less delay in hiring new developers
 - Cases
 - Best / Planned / Current / Worst cases
 - Coarse Dates
 - Q3 2009
 - Confidence Factors
 - April 1 – 10% probability, July 1 – 50%, etc.

- Account for resource experience or skill
 - Up to a point
 - Often needed more on the “low” end, such as for a new or junior person
- Allow for “non-project” time & common tasks
 - Meetings, phone calls, web surfing, sick days
- There are commercial ‘estimation tools’ available
 - They typically require configuration based on past data

- Remember: “manage expectations”
- Parkinson’s Law
 - “Work expands to fill the time available”
- The Student Syndrome
 - Procrastination until the last minute (cram)

- McConnell: 9, "Scheduling"
- Schwalbe: 5, "Project Time Management"
- URLs: See projectreference.com on "PERT/CPM"
 - <http://www.projectreference.com/#PERT>

- Create a WBS for your project
 - Please think this through. You're the PM now!
- Guidelines
 - Do it at managerial level (see slide 14)
 - 4-7 nodes at 1st level
 - 2-5 nodes at 2nd level (per each node at 1st level)
 - You can go deeper at your discretion.
 - As we covered in class, you can use either a process, product or hybrid approach.
 - For most of your projects I suspect the process approach would work best at managerial level.
 - Follow the standard hierarchical numbering scheme for WBS structures.
 - Use the Word template of homework–1
 - Keep only the coversheet
 - Update the title to “homework – 2 : WBS”
 - Submit to mpsp2010@gmail.com as you did with homework-1

Questions?

65