Introduction

The intrinsic Engineering Value (IEV) estimate of a software asset is a composite dollar value that is a function of several parameters that reflect the content of the software. IEV includes but is not limited to: software metrics (e.g. lines of code, number of classes); third party content (e.g. open source content); team metrics (e.g. years of experience); IP content (e.g. patents, propriety algorithms). Figure 1, summarizes how IEV contrasts and complements with commonly used measures such as the Cost and Market Value.

Figure 1: Cost and Market Value Measures versus IEV

Cost of a Software asset seems a definitive accounting measure...

Market Value of a Software Asset is an estimated and negotiated financial measure...

Intrinsic Engineering Value (IEV) is an engineering measure. It is a composite dollar amount derived from key ingredients in software assets.

But cost components, company overheads, labor rates, account standards, team productivity, exchange rates and other variables mask the real engineering value of the software asset.

It depends on assumptions around numerous factors including: time to market, projected growth rates, engineering value of the software and other synergies.

IEV can be used as input or complementary to Cost and Market Value measures. It can help with estimating reverse engineering costs for buy versus build decisions, comparing assets from various companies and departments on engineering value, etc.

During the course of a software company acquisition the technical diligence team may be asked, “What do you estimate it would take us (the acquiring company) to build the software asset ourselves? Similarly, during the course of licensing a software asset to another company, the technical team may be asked, “What do you estimate it took them (the licensing company) to build the software asset? The objective of the research is to develop an IEV Model that can help answer these questions. For example, assuming a linear relationship between IEV and its parametric variables:
\[ IEV = C_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i X_i \]

Where, \( X_1, ..., X_n \) = Intrinsic Value Variables and \( C_0, ..., C_n \) are the coefficients or weights.

For a given class of software products, the objective of this Research is to identify the IEV variables and coefficients that can help estimate IEV.

In the May 2007 Pace DPS Research Day Proceedings, an idea paper with regard to the IEV was presented. This paper presents an overview of the Research Methodology for the computation of IEV and the details of the first phase of data collection.

**Definitions and Terminology**

The Webster Dictionary defines *Intrinsic* as- “belonging to the essential nature or constitution of a thing”. In the context of the software asset the intrinsic aspects include software engineering metrics such as the number of lines of code, function points, number of Application Programming Interfaces, number of resources utilized and other variables that constitute a software asset.

The term *Value* has varied meanings in the Webster Dictionary including – “assigned or computed numerical quantity, something intrinsically valuable or desirable, estimate the monetary worth”. In the context of this Research the Engineering value of the software asset represents a numerical measure that reflects the estimating of what it would take to build a software asset that is similar to the one that has been created.

**Research Hypothesis**

Software industry is a dynamic industry that is characterized by numerous mergers and business arrangements (licensing, joint ventures, etc). The Research hypothesis is that:

1. The IEV measure will be important for professionals involved with acquiring software assets from other companies.
2. The IEV measure will be important for professionals involved with licensing or partnering with other companies for software commercialization.
3. A set of variables that define the IEV for a particular class of assets can be identified.
4. The IEV measure is a more effective measure than other measures such a cost estimate based on lines of code.
5. The IEV model can be used as a predictive tool to estimate the intrinsic engineering value of software assets.

**Research Methodology**

The data for the Research effort is being collected in three phases.

**Phase 1**

The objective of this phase is to test the hypothesis that the IEV will be useful and identify preliminary variables that define the IEV. Four groups of software professional will be interviewed.
Group 1: This group will consist of business professionals involved with acquiring a software asset from a different company. The data required to access the need for IEV in this sample will be collected using interview questions shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Questions for the Members of the Business Team involved with Software Acquisition

1) What was or is your primary role in the Software Company Acquisition process?
   - Financial Analysis
   - Strategy and Business Development
   - Product Offering Development
   - ________________

2) Do you have measure(s) that quantify the intrinsic engineering value of the software?
   - Yes
   - No

3) As part of the due diligence how important is it that the technical due diligence team quantify the intrinsic engineering value of the software asset being acquired?
   - Not important
   - Important
   - Very Important

4) If intrinsic engineering value of the software is made available how useful would it be?
   - Not useful
   - Useful
   - Very useful

5) If the Intrinsic Engineering Value is available how would you use it?
   - Input to Pricing
   - Comparison of Product offering across companies
   - Input to good will estimation
   - Input to book value estimation
   - ________________
   - ________________
   - ________________

General Comments and Suggestions: ______________________________

Group 2: This group will consist of technical professional who were actually involved with acquiring a software asset from a different company. The data required for accessing the need for IEV and preliminary IEV variables will be collected using interview questions shown in Table 2 and sample IEV variable list shown in Table 3.
Table 2: Questions for the Members of the Technical Team involved with Acquisition.

1) Did you find the need to identify the intrinsic engineering value during the course of the acquisition analysis?
   - Yes
   - No

2) Are you aware of or use any quantitative model that can help estimate the intrinsic engineering value of the software?
   - Yes
   - No

3) If the intrinsic engineering value of a software asset could be estimated and modeled how useful would it be?
   - Not Useful
   - Useful
   - Very Useful

4) If you were to quantify the intrinsic engineering value of a commercially available software product what are the TOP 5 variables you would choose?
   - Variable 1: ___________
   - Variable 2: ___________
   - Variable 3: ___________
   - Variable 4: ___________
   - Variable 5: ___________

5) If you were to quantify the intrinsic engineering value of a software asset that is still in development what are the TOP 5 variables you would choose?
   - Variable 1: ___________
   - Variable 2: ___________
   - Variable 3: ___________
   - Variable 4: ___________
   - Variable 5: ___________

General Comments and additional variables: _______________________

Table 3: Sample Intrinsic Value Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Metrics</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of lines of code</td>
<td>Number of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes</td>
<td>Type of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming language</td>
<td>Duration of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Metrics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type of Software</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of function points</td>
<td>Component/SDK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of use cases</td>
<td>Embedded software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Property</strong></td>
<td>Web application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithm complexity</td>
<td>32 bit client server application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Patents</td>
<td>Web services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Third Party Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming APIs</td>
<td>Open Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-system integration APIs</td>
<td>Third Party Dlls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 3: This group will consist of business professionals involved with commercializing software innovations through licensing, joint ventures or other business arrangements. The data required to access the need for IEV with this segment of professionals will be collected using interview questions as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Questions for the Members of the Business Team involved with commercializing Software innovations.

1) What was or is your primary role in the Software commercialization process?
   - Financial Analysis
   - Strategy and Business Development
   - Product Offering Development
   - ____________________

2) Do you have measure(s) that quantify the intrinsic engineering value of the software?
   - Yes
   - No

3) As part of your licensing, joint venture or other business arrangements how important is it to estimate the intrinsic engineering value of the software innovation you are trying to commercialize?
   - Not important
   - Important
   - Very Important

4) If intrinsic engineering value of the software is made available how useful would it be?
   - Not useful
   - Useful
   - Very useful

5) If the Intrinsic Engineering Value is available how would you use it?
   - Input to Pricing
   - Estimating potential partners reserve engineering costs
   - Identifying high intrinsic value assets
   - ____________________
   - ____________________
   - ____________________

General Comments and Suggestions: ______________________________

Group 4: This group will consist of technical professionals who may be asked to assess the IEV for software assets. The data required for accessing the need for IEV and preliminary IEV variables will be collected using interview questions shown in Table 5 and sample IEV variable list shown in Table 3.
Table 5: Questions for potential members in Technical Team that may be asked to assess Intrinsic Engineering Value.

1) Did you find the need to identify the intrinsic engineering value or other cost measures (cost estimate, reverse engineering costs, etc)?
   - Yes
   - No

2) Are you aware of or use any quantitative model that can help estimate the intrinsic engineering value of the software if you were asked for an estimate?
   - Yes
   - No

3) If the intrinsic engineering value of a software asset could be estimated and modeled how useful would it be?
   - Not Useful
   - Useful
   - Very Useful

4) If you were to quantify the intrinsic engineering value of a commercially available software product what are the TOP 5 variables you would choose?
   - Variable 1: ___________
   - Variable 2: ___________
   - Variable 3: ___________
   - Variable 4: ___________
   - Variable 5: ___________

5) If you were to quantify the intrinsic engineering value of a software asset that is still in development what are the TOP 5 variables you would choose?
   - Variable 1: ___________
   - Variable 2: ___________
   - Variable 3: ___________
   - Variable 4: ___________
   - Variable 5: ___________

General Comments and additional variables: _______________________
  ______________________________________________________________

Phase 2
This phase will involve refining the intrinsic value variables (x variables) for software assets that need to be commercialized. The refining process will include grouping of similar variables, developing a scale for the IEV variables and testing the significance of the IEV variables.

Phase 3
Bayesian, Logistical Regression and Multiple Regression were considered to establish IEV measure. Bayesian would be useful in answering a probabilistic question. For example, what is the probability that it the IEV is $2 million for software product A? However, it does not give an estimated, absolute measure.
Logistical Regression was considered because it takes into account categorical variables (e.g., software product A has a Patent - Yes or No). However, since software products have a combination of both absolute variables (lines of code, number of person years, etc) and categorical variables (type of code, patents, etc) it was recommend using multiple regression with some modifications by subject matter experts in regression.

A linear regression assumes a function of the form:
\[ y = C_0 + C_1 \times x_1 + C_2 \times x_2 + \ldots + C_n \times x_n \]
and finds the values of \( C_0, C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n \).

In this context of this Research
\[ Y = \text{IEV} \]
\[ X_1 \ldots X_n = \text{Software Engineering Metrics (Lines of Code, Person Years, Patents, etc)} \]
The X variables and values are available. However, there is no historical IEV data or weights relative to the lines of code, patents, etc (\( C_0 \ldots C_n \) values). This makes it impossible to solve the equation. Therefore, multiple Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) will be asked to provide the IEV to solve the regression equation. Table 6 and Table 7 illustrate a hypothetical preliminary model in this regard.

Table 6, contains the sample data. In this case, the IEV for a software asset (A, B, C, D, E, F and G) is established by various subject matter experts. For example, the IEV for Software product A is set by two SMEs (SME 1 and SME 2) and the IEV for Software product D is set by four SMEs (SME1, SME2, SME 3 and SME4). The X values which are software engineering metrics (Lines of code/LOC, number of patents and person year investments/PY) are fed into the regression model.

Regression analysis will be used to solve for the coefficients in the regression equation (sample in Table 7). The resulting parameterized model will be tested with new data to generate predictive IEV values and be compared to other software estimating methods for differential analysis.

**Table 6: Sample Data Set**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
<th>SME Observations</th>
<th>IEV (Y)</th>
<th>LOC (X1)</th>
<th>Patents (X2)</th>
<th>PY (X3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SME1</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SME2</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SME3</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SME4</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SME5</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>SME6</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>SME7</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>SME8</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>SME9</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>SME10</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>SME11</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>SME12</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>SME13</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SME14</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SME15</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>SME16</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Results

SUMMARY OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.94772088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.89817487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.87271858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>132870.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.86873E+12</td>
<td>6.23E+11</td>
<td>35.28303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.11856E+11</td>
<td>1.77E+10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.08059E+12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
<th>Lower 95.0%</th>
<th>Upper 95.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-76743.3611</td>
<td>120042.0846</td>
<td>-0.639304</td>
<td>0.534639</td>
<td>-338292.5906</td>
<td>184805.8684</td>
<td>-338292.5906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Variable 1</td>
<td>1.68502826</td>
<td>0.982208267</td>
<td>1.715551</td>
<td>0.111925</td>
<td>-0.455019676</td>
<td>3.825076196</td>
<td>-0.455019676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Variable 2</td>
<td>-6505.80027</td>
<td>18379.02797</td>
<td>-0.35398</td>
<td>0.729496</td>
<td>-46550.26152</td>
<td>33538.66097</td>
<td>-46550.26152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Variable 3</td>
<td>287878.114</td>
<td>31606.08706</td>
<td>9.108312</td>
<td>9.73E-07</td>
<td>219014.3669</td>
<td>356741.8605</td>
<td>219014.3669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In the May 2007 Pace DPS Research Day Proceedings, an idea paper with regard to the IEV was presented. This paper presents an overview of the Research Methodology for the computation of IEV and the details of the first phase of data collection. The data for Phase 1 will be collected in May-June 2008 and Phases 2 and 3 will be refined and developed based on the results in from Phase 1. Please send feedback and comments to the author at nvreddy@yahoo.com.