

Chapter 4.6

System-of-Systems Cost Estimation: Analysis of Lead System Integrator Engineering Activities

Jo Ann Lane

University of Southern California, USA

Barry Boehm

University of Southern California, USA

ABSTRACT

As organizations strive to expand system capabilities through the development of system-of-systems (SoS) architectures, they want to know “how much effort” and “how long” to implement the SoS. In order to answer these questions, it is important to first understand the types of activities performed in SoS architecture development and integration and how these vary across different SoS implementations. This article provides results of research conducted to determine types of SoS lead system integrator (LSI) activities and how these differ from the more traditional system

engineering activities described in Electronic Industries Alliance (EIA) 632 (“Processes for Engineering a System”). This research further analyzed effort and schedule issues on “very large” SoS programs to more clearly identify and profile the types of activities performed by the typical LSI and to determine organizational characteristics that significantly impact overall success and productivity of the LSI effort. The results of this effort have been captured in a reduced-parameter version of the constructive SoS integration cost model (COSOSIMO) that estimates LSI SoS engineering (SoSE) effort.

INTRODUCTION

As organizations strive to expand system capabilities through the development of system-of-systems (SoS) architectures, they want to know “how much effort” and “how long” to implement the SoS. Efforts are currently underway at the University of Southern California (USC) Center for Systems and Software Engineering (CSSE) to develop a cost model to estimate the effort associated with SoS lead system integrator (LSI) activities. The research described in this article is in support of the development of this cost model, the constructive SoS integration cost model (COSOSIMO). Research conducted to date in this area has focused more on technical characteristics of the SoS. However, feedback from USC CSSE industry affiliates indicates that the extreme complexity typically associated with SoS architectures and political issues between participating organizations have a major impact on the LSI effort. This is also supported by surveys of system acquisition managers (Blanchette, 2005) and studies of failed programs (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973). The focus of this current research is to further investigate effort and schedule issues on “very large” SoS programs and to determine key activities in the development of SoSs and organizational characteristics that significantly impact overall success and productivity of the program.

This article first describes the context for the COSOSIMO cost model, then presents a conceptual view of the cost model that has been developed using expert judgment, describes the methodology being used to develop the model, and summarizes conclusions reached to date.

COSOSIMO CONTEXT

We are seeing a growing trend in industry and the government agencies to “quickly” incorporate new technologies and expand the capabilities of legacy systems by integrating them with

other legacy systems, commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) products, and new systems into a system of systems, generally with the intent to share information from related systems and to create new, emergent capabilities that are not possible with the existing stove-piped systems. With this development approach, we see new activities being performed to define the new architecture, identify sources to either supply or develop the required components, and then to integrate and test these high level components. Along with this “system-of-systems” development approach, we have seen a new role in the development process evolve to perform these activities: that of the LSI. A recent Air Force study (United States Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, 2005) clearly states that the SoS Engineering (SoSE) effort and focus related to LSI activities is considerably different from the more traditional system development projects. According to this report, key areas where LSI activities are more complex or different than traditional systems engineering are the system architecting, especially in the areas of system interoperability and system “ilities;” acquisition and management; and anticipation of needs.

Key to developing a cost model such as COSOSIMO is understanding what a “system-of-systems” is. Early literature research (Jamshidi, 2005) showed that the term “system-of-systems” can mean many things across different organizations. For the purposes of the COSOSIMO cost model development, the research team has focused on the SoS definitions provided in Maier (1999) and Sage and Cuppan (2001): an evolutionary net-centric architecture that allows geographically distributed component systems to exchange information and perform tasks within the framework that they are not capable of performing on their own outside of the framework. This is often referred to as “emergent behaviors.” Key issues in developing an SoS are the security of information shared between the various component systems, how to get the right information to the right destinations efficiently without overwhelming users with un-

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/system-systems-cost-estimation/48592

Related Content

Sustainable Waste Management System and Reverse Logistic Network Design in Plastic Industry: A Case Study of Turkey

Emel Kizilkaya Aydogan, Nuray Ates, Nigmet Uzal, Fulya Zaraland Petraq Papajorgji (2013). *Enterprise Business Modeling, Optimization Techniques, and Flexible Information Systems* (pp. 159-176).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/sustainable-waste-management-system-reverse/77967

Monitoring Enterprise Applications and the future of Self-Healing Applications

Shuchih E. Changand Boris Minkin (2008). *International Journal of Enterprise Information Systems* (pp. 54-66).

www.irma-international.org/article/monitoring-enterprise-applications-future-self/2140

Building Collective Awareness in Virtual Teams: The Effect of Leadership Behavioral Style

Mohamed Daassi, Nabila Jawadi, Marc Favierand Michel Kalika (2010). *Leadership in the Digital Enterprise: Issues and Challenges* (pp. 105-117).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/building-collective-awareness-virtual-teams/37090

Architecture-Driven Business Transformation

C. Lawrence (2007). *Handbook of Enterprise Systems Architecture in Practice* (pp. 207-220).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/architecture-driven-business-transformation/19426

Revisiting the Holt-Winters' Additive Method for Better Forecasting

Seng Hansun, Vincent Charles, Christiana Rini Indratiand Subanar (2019). *International Journal of Enterprise Information Systems* (pp. 43-57).

www.irma-international.org/article/revisiting-the-holt-winters-additive-method-for-better-forecasting/227001