



ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7  
Software & System Engineering  
Secretariat: CANADA (SCC)

## ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 N2521

2001-07-24

**Doc. Type** Supplier Declaration

**Title** Supplier's Declaration of Conformity to ISO/IEC 14143-1:1998 for the IFPUG PAS Submission.

**Source** IFPUG PAS Representative

**Project**

**Status**

**References**

**Action ID** FYI or ACT

**Due Date**

**Mailing Date** 2001-07-24

**Distribution** SC7\_AG; JTC1 Sec.; P, O & L Members

**Medium**

**No. Of Pages** 10

**Note**

**B.2**

**B.2.1**

**B.2.1.1**

**Conformity evaluation checklist**

**Part 1 - requirements**

**Labelling conventions**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)	satisfies clause 4.4.1??	satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?	corresponding requirements
<p><b>evaluation question</b></p> <p>a) Does the Candidate FSM Method use a name that distinguishes it from all other existing FSM Methods?</p>	Yes	Yes	<b>7(a)</b>
<p>b) If the Candidate FSM Method implies that there are other versions of the Method, then does it also include the current version number that it appends to its name?</p>	Yes	Yes	<b>7(b)</b>

**B.2.1.2**

**B.2.1.2.1**

**Functional User Requirements**

**Source information**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)	satisfies clause 4.4.1??	satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?	corresponding requirements
<p><b>evaluation question</b></p> <p>a) Does the Candidate FSM Method use Functional User Requirements when deriving Functional Size?</p>	Yes	Yes	<b>6 (b)</b>
<p>b) Does the Candidate FSM Method use a concept of functional size that corresponds to a size of the software derived by quantifying the Functional User Requirements?</p>	Yes	Yes	<b>6 (b)</b>

c) Does the Candidate FSM Method exclude Technical Requirements from the Functional User Requirements when deriving functional size?	As outlined in the PAS submitter report accompanying the submission, the IFPUG 4.1 Unadjusted FP Method, specifically excludes the Value Adjustment Factor as a mandatory step. The specification also cites specific examples (in Chapters 6 and 7) to illustrate the exclusion of Technical Requirements from Functional Size.	Yes	Yes	5.1.1.1 (a)
d) Does the Candidate FSM Method exclude Quality Requirements from the Functional User Requirements when deriving Functional Size?	As outlined in the PAS submitter report accompanying the submission, the IFPUG 4.1 Unadjusted FP Method, specifically excludes the Value Adjustment Factor as a mandatory step. The specification also cites specific examples (in Chapters 6 and 7) to illustrate the exclusion of Quality Requirements from Functional Size.	Yes	Yes	5.1.1.1 (a)
e) Is the representation of the Functional User Requirements used by the Candidate FSM Method based on the perspective of the users?	Chapter 3 of the specification expressly deals with the User View, and throughout the document, only the "users" perspective is used. Definition of Function Point Analysis (Glossary): Function point analysis. A standard method for measuring software development and maintenance from the <i>customer's point of view</i> .	Yes	Yes	5.1.1.1 (a)
f) Can the Candidate FSM Method be applied as soon as any Functional User Requirements are defined and while they are available?	Chapter 3 identifies that early requirements can be used to size software using this FSM Method.	Yes	Yes	5.1.1.1 (b)
g) Are the Functional User Requirements used by the Candidate FSM Method a sub-set of the user requirements, and do they represent the user practices and procedures that the software must perform to fulfil the users' needs?	This specification explains and through examples, demonstrates, that the Functional User Requirements used by the IFPUG 4.1 Unadjusted Function Point Method represent the functions (user practices and procedures) required by the users.	Yes	Yes	5.1.1.1 (a)

**B.2.1.2.2**

evaluation question	Scope of the Measurement	satisfies	satisfies the	corresponding
	locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)	clause 4.4.1?	requirements of evaluation question?	requirements

<p>a) Is the determination of the Scope of the FSM an activity required to derive Functional Size?</p>	<p>Chapter 1 introduces the Concept of Scope of the FSM, and Chapter 5 fully explores and explains that the determination of the Scope of the FSM is the second step in the FSM Method process. From the specification: "The counting scope defines the functionality which will be included in a particular function point count.</p> <p>The scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Defines a (sub) set of the software being sized</li> <li>· Is determined by the purpose for performing the function point count</li> <li>· Identifies which functions will be included in the function point count so as to provide answers relevant to the purpose for counting</li> </ul> <p><i>Could include more than one application</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>6 (a)</b></p>
<p>b) Is the identification of which Functional User Requirements are to be included within the Scope of the FSM an activity required to derive Functional Size?</p>	<p>Specification identifies that we use logical design and Functional User Requirements to define the scopr of the FSM</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>6 (b)</b></p>
<p>c) Does the Candidate FSM Method describe how to identify which Functional User Requirements will be included within the Scope of the FSM?</p>	<p>Chapter 5 specifically addresses Scope and Boundary</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.2 (b)</b></p>
<p>d) Does the Candidate FSM Method have a concept of the Scope of the FSM that corresponds to the set of Functional User Requirements to be included in a specific FSM instance?</p>	<p>Chapter 5 specifically addresses Scope and Boundary</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>6 (b)</b></p>

**B.2.1.2.3**

**Boundary**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)

satisfies clause 4.4.1?

satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?

corresponding requirements

evaluation question

a) Does the boundary correspond to the conceptual interface between the software under study and its users? Only answer this question if it is applicable to the FSM Method being evaluated.

<p>Chapter 5 thoroughly addresses this issue. From the specification: "The application boundary indicates the border between the software being measured and the user. The application boundary :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Defines what is external to the application</li> <li>· Is the conceptual interface between the 'internal' application and the 'external' user world</li> <li>· Acts as a 'membrane' through which data processed by transactions (EIs, EOs and EQs) pass into and out from the application</li> <li>· Encloses the logical data maintained by the application (ILFs)</li> <li>· Assists in identifying the logical data referenced by but not maintained within this application (EIFs)</li> <li>· Is dependent on the user's external business view of the application. It is independent of technical and/or implementation considerations</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.2 (f)</b></p>	
<p>b) Where the Candidate FSM Method implies a relationship exists between a Base Functional Component (BFC) Type and the boundary, is there a definition of that relationship for each BFC Type?</p>	<p>See Chapters 2-7 for specific definitions for each BFC Type: EI, EO, EQ, ILF, EIF and its particular relationship with the boundary: EI- Data crosses the boundary, EO- Data leaves the boundary, EQ- Data leaves the boundary, ILF- data maintained within the boundary, EIF- data referenced outside and not maintained within the boundary (See Chapters 5, 6, 7)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.2 (f)</b></p>

**B.2.1.2.4**

**Functional Domain**

<p>evaluation question</p>	<p>locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)</p>	<p>satisfies clause 4.4.1?</p>	<p>satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?</p>	<p>corresponding requirements</p>

<p>a) Does the Candidate FSM Method use the concept of Functional Domain which corresponds to a class of software based on the characteristics of Functional User Requirements which are pertinent to FSM?</p>	<p>ISO/IEC 14143-1:1998 specifies that an FSM Method describe the Functional Domains to which it may apply. The specification is applicable to any class of software (i.e., IFPUG function points are equally applicable to any type or layer of software), there is and there is no need to restrict its domain of application. (In other words, IFPUG function points apply to all functional domains without prejudice). This is outlined in chapter 2.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.1 (d)</b></p>
<p>b) Is there a description of the Functional Domains to which the Candidate FSM Method can be applied?</p>	<p>Applicable to all types of software, not a particular functional domain. See question a above.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.1 (d)</b></p>

**B.2.1.3**

**B.2.1.3.1**

**Application of an FSM  
Base Functional Component (BFC)  
locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)**

	<b>consistent, satisfies clause 4.4.1?</b>	<b>satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?</b>	<b>corresponding requirements</b>
--	--	---	---------------------------------------

**evaluation question**

<p>a) Does the Candidate FSM Method have, or refer to, a definition for the concept of a BFC?</p>	<p>Base Functional Components (BFC) are defined as elementary processes in this specification. See Chapter 1 (Overview) and throughout specification.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.1 (a)</b></p>
<p>b) Does this definition for a BFC correspond to being an elementary unit of Functional User Requirements?</p>	<p>Specification defines Elementary Process as an elementary unit of FUR. (Chapters 1, 2, 6, 7, Glossary)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.1.2 (a)</b></p>
<p>c) Does the FSM Method use these elementary units of Functional User Requirements for measurement purposes?</p>	<p>Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7 illustrate how the FSM Method uses these elementary units of FUR for measurement purposes.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.2 (a)</b></p>
<p>d) Does the Candidate FSM Method define the attributes of BFCs?</p>	<p>Specification defines the Data and Transaction Component attributes of BFCs. (See Foreword, Chapter 1 through 4, 6, 7, Glossary)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.1 (a)</b></p>

e) Does the Candidate FSM Method define rules used to assess the BFCs?	BFCs are defined and categorized through the use of BFC types as outlined in Chapter 1, 2 and Chapters 6 and 7 (and Glossary)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.1.1 (b)</b>
f) Is there a description of how to identify the BFCs within the Functional User Requirements?	This process is described with definitions, charts and abundant illustrative examples throughout the specification (See Chapter 2, 5, 6, 7)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.2 (c)</b>
g) Are the characteristics of a BFC such that they only express Functional User Requirements?	Specification states that the only characteristics to measure are those that are FUR that the user requests and receives (See Chapter 2 and throughout specification)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.2 (a)</b>
h) Are the characteristics of a BFC such that they do not express Technical Requirements?	Specification outlines the characteristics of a BFC and BFC types, and specifically states they are independent of Technical Requirements (Chapter 2 and throughout specification)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.2 (b)</b>
i) Are the characteristics of a BFC such that they do not express Quality Requirements?	Specification outlines the characteristics of a BFC and BFC types, and specifically states they are independent of Quality Requirements (Chapter 2 and throughout specification)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.2 (c)</b>
j) Is the identification of the BFCs within the Functional User Requirements an activity required to derive Functional Size?	Identification of BFCs and their categorization into BFC types is introduced in Chapter 2, and detailed in Chapters 6 and 7.	Yes	Yes	<b>6 (c)</b>

**B.2.1.3.2**

**Base Functional Component Type (BFC Type)**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)

satisfies clause 4.4.1?

satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?

corresponding requirements

**evaluation question**

a) Is there a concept of a BFC Type that corresponds to being a category of BFCs?	Two major BFC types (categories) are identified: Data Functions (ILFs and EIFs) and Transactional Functions (EI, EO and EQ)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.2 (a)</b>
b) Is there a definition for each BFC Type?	Each BFC type is fully defined (See Chapters 6 and 7 for details, as well as the Glossary)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.2 (a)</b>
c) Can a BFC be classified as one, and only one, BFC Type?	Specification provides unique categories of BFC Types identified as EI, EO, EQ, ILF, EIF. (See Chapters 2, 6, 7, Glossary)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.2 (d)</b>

d) If there is more than one BFC Type, is there a definition of how to classify BFCs into the appropriate BFC Type?	Definitions are provided for how to classify BFCs into the appropriate BFC Type (EI, EO, EQ, ILF, EIF) and how to assess the complexity of each instance of BFC. Abundant examples used to demonstrate the classification process (Chapters 6, and 7)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.2 (d)</b>
e) If the Candidate FSM Method implies that there are relationships between BFC Types, then does it provide a definition of those relationships? Only answer this question if it is applicable to the FSM Method being evaluated.	The summary of processing logic used by EI, EO, EQ and the summary of the functions performed by EI, EO, EQ define these relationships. Relationships between Data Functions and Transactional Functions are also described in the specification.	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.2 (g)</b>
f) If the Candidate FSM Method has more than one BFC Type, is the classification into types one of the activities required to derive Functional Size?	The classification into types is a mandatory step as depicted in the process diagrams and further described by narrative text. (Chapters 2, 6, 7 in particular)	Yes	Yes	<b>6 (d)</b>

**B.2.1.3.3**

**Deriving Functional Size**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)

satisfies clause 4.4.1?

satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?

corresponding requirements

**evaluation question**

a) Is the functional size derived through the evaluation of BFCs?	Specification derives functional size through evaluation of its BFCs as clearly outlined in Chapters 4, 5,6,7	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.1.1 (c)</b>
b) Is the derivation of Functional Size independent of the <b>effort</b> required to <b>develop</b> the software being measured?	Development effort is not part of this specification's formulae to size software (Throughout specification and Appendix A)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.3 (a)</b>
c) Is the derivation of Functional Size independent of the <b>effort</b> required to <b>support</b> the software being measured?	Support effort is not part of this specification's formulae to size software (Throughout specification and Appendix A)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.3 (b)</b>
d) Is the derivation of Functional Size independent of the <b>methods</b> used to <b>develop</b> the software being measured ?	Development methods are not part of this specification's formulae to size software (Throughout specification and Appendix A)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.3 (c)</b>

e) Is the derivation of Functional Size independent of the <b>methods</b> used to <b>support</b> the software being measured?	Support methods are not part of this specification's formulae to size software (Throughout specification and Appendix A)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.3 (d)</b>
f) Is the derivation of Functional Size independent of any <b>physical</b> components of the software being measured?	Physical components of the software being measure are not part of this specification's formulae to size software. (Throughout specification and Appendix A)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.3 (e)</b>
g) Is the derivation of Functional Size independent of any <b>technological</b> components of the software being measured?	Technological components of the software being measured are not part of this specification's formulae to size software (Throughout specification and Appendix A)	Yes	Yes	<b>5.1.3 (f)</b>
h) Is there a definition of how to assign a numeric value to a BFC according to its BFC Type?	Specification provides complexity matrices and corresponding numerical contribution based on each type	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.2 (e)</b>
i) Is assigning a numeric value to a BFC one of the activities required to derive Functional Size?	The mandatory steps in the specification require that a numeric value be assigned (according to the assignment complexity matrices) to every BFC instance in the FUR	Yes	Yes	<b>6 (e)</b>
j) Does the Candidate FSM Method define how to calculate the Functional Size?	How to calculate the Functional Size is defined in Chapters 2, 4, 5, 9 (Unadjusted section of Chapter 9) and Appendix A. Specific equations and identification of component parts are explained in the specification.	Yes	Yes	<b>6 (f)</b>

**B.2.1.3.4**

**Units of Functional Size**

<b>evaluation question</b>	<b>locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)</b>	<b>satisfies clause 4.4.1?</b>	<b>satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?</b>	<b>corresponding requirements</b>
a) Is there a definition of the units in which the Functional Size is expressed?	See Glossary and Overview Chapter 2	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.1.1 (c)</b>
b) When reporting the Functional Size, is the user required to qualify it with the units specified by the Candidate FSM Method?	Designates that when reporting the Functional Size using this FSM Method, Function Points are the unit of measure	Yes	Yes	<b>5.2.3 (a)</b>

c) When reporting the Functional Size, is the user required to qualify it with the name specified by the Candidate FSM Method?	Naming conventions for reporting Functional Size include the FSM Method units and type of count. Specification designates the use of Function Points as part of the numeric value together with the version number of the FSM Method.	Yes	Yes	5.2.3 (b)
d) If the Candidate FSM Method is customised, is the user required to indicate this when reporting the Functional Size?	Version of the specification is always included in the reporting of Functional Size to avoid confusion between counts done using an earlier version of the FSM Method.	Yes	Yes	5.2.3 (c)

**B.2.2**

**Part 2 - recommendations**

**B.2.2.1**

**FSM Method**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)

satisfies clause 4.4.1?

satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?

corresponding recommendations

**evaluation question**

a) Is the Candidate FSM Method independent of any particular software development method or technology?

There is no dependence on any particular software development method or technology for this specification.	Y	Y	5.1.1.2
--	---	---	---------

**B.2.2.2**

**Documentation of the result of applying an FSM**

locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)

satisfies clause 4.4.1?

satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?

corresponding recommendations

**evaluation question**

a) Is there a description of the kind of information necessary to enable the Candidate FSM Method to be applied?

Specification identifies the various types of documentation to perform Function Point Analysis	Yes	Yes	5.2.1.2 (a)
--	-----	-----	-------------

<p>b) Are there guidelines provided on how to document a specific instance of FSM?</p>	<p>Specification documents the various types of counts (instances of counts) -- Development, Enhancement and Application counts. Guidance is also provided in the examples and summary tables about how to document counts. (Is particularly useful for ensuring repeatability and for facilitating conversion (should it be necessary) of a count forward should there be subsequent FSM Method version(s).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.2 (b)</b></p>
--	--	------------	------------	---------------------------

**B.2.2.3**

**Using the Functional Size Results**  
 locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)      satisfies clause 4.4.1?      satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?      corresponding recommendations

**evaluation question**

<p>a) Is there a description of the purposes for which the FSM Method can best be used, such that the users of the FSM can judge its suitability for their purpose?</p>	<p>Foreword by recognized industry expert Capers Jones expounds on usage. Chapters 1 and 2 also explains intended usage.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.2 (c)</b></p>
---	--	------------	------------	---------------------------

**B.2.2.4**

**Convertibility of Functional Size**  
 locations (comments pertaining to PAS submission)      satisfies clause 4.4.1?      satisfies the requirements of evaluation question?      corresponding recommendations

**evaluation question**

<p>a) Is there a statement of the degree of convertibility to other size measurement methods?</p>	<p>Degree of convertibility to other existing or potential FSM Methods is not part of the specification.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p><b>5.2.1.2 (d)</b></p>
---	--	------------	------------	---------------------------