

CERTIFICATE

OF APPRECIATION

PROUDLY PRESENTED TO

Renny Sari Dewi

For recognition and appreciation of your contribution as **Presenter**, has presented paper entitled
Applying Software Development Risk Taxonomy in Use Case Points Complexity Factor

in 5th International Conference of Computer and Informatics Engineering

Chair of Computational Intelligence
Society IEEE Indonesia Chapter



Prof. Dr. Ir. Teddy Mantoro, M.Sc., SMIEEE

Chair of The 5th IC2IE 2022



Dr. Anita Hidayati, S.Kom., M.Kom.

IC2iE 2022

Prosiding

5th

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMPUTER AND INFORMATICS ENGINEERING

Envisioning the Future of ICT for the New Globalization

13-14 September 2022

IEEE Catalog Number : CFP22JVF-ART
ISBN : 978-1-6654-5338-7

 <https://ic2ie.org/>



2022 5th International Conference on Computer and Informatics Engineering (IC2IE)

13-14 September 2022
Jakarta, Indonesia

IEEE CATALOG NUMBER: CFP22JVF-ART
ISBN 978-1-6654-5338-7

Editor:

Indra Hermawan, Asep Taufik Muharram

All rights reserved. Copyright ©2022 by IEEE

No parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system of transmitted by any form or means without permission of the publisher. For reprint or republication permission, email to IEEE Copyrights Manager at:

pubs-permissions@ieee.org

2022 5th IC2IE Committee

General Chair

Prof. Teddy Mantoro, M.Sc., Ph.D., Sampoerna University

Steering Committee

Dr. Ing. Wahyudi Hasbi, Indonesian National Institute of Aeronautics and Space, Indonesia

Prof. Gamantyo Hendratoro, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember, Indonesia

Publication Chair

Iklima Ermis Ismail, S. Kom., M. Kom, Politeknik Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

Scientific Committee

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rozaimi Bin Ghazali, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia

Diah Priharsari, Ph. D, Brawijaya University

Dr. Anggun Fitriani Isnawati S.T., M. Eng, IT Telkom Purwokerto

Dr. Assaf Arief, Universitas Khairun

Dr. Ati Suci Dian Martha, Universitas Telkom

Dr. Arfive Gandhi, Telkom University

Dr. Dadang Syarif Sihabudin Sahid, S.Si., M.Sc., Universitas Gadjah Mada

Dr. Dewi Yanti Liliana, S.Kom., M.Kom, Politeknik Negeri Jakarta

Dr. Dra. Dwina Kuswardani, M. Kom., Sekolah Tinggi Teknik PLN

Dr. Elissa Nadia Madi, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia

Dr. Eng. Favian Dewanta, S.T., M.Eng., Universitas Telkom

Dr. Elin Cahyaningsih, Universitas Gunadarma

Dr. Edwin Setiawan Nugraha, Presiden University

Dr. Evi Yulianti, University of Indonesia

Dr. Ariana Yunita, Universitas Pertamina

Dr. Ira Maryati, M.P, Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional (BRIN)

Dr. Foni Agus Setiawan, M. Kom, Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional (BRIN)

Dr. Ford Lumban Gaol, Binus University

Dr. Herlina, S.T., M.T., Sriwijaya University

Dr. I Ketut Agung Enrico, Institut Teknologi Telkom Purwokerto

Dr. Ir. Lukas Tanutama, M.M., Bina Nusantara University

Dr. Ir. Tanty Oktavia, S.Kom., M.M., Bina Nusantara University

Dr. Isdawimah, S.T., M.T., Politeknik Negeri Jakarta

Dr. Istiadi, ST, MT, Widyagama University

Dr. Juni Nurma Sari, S.Kom.,M.MT, Universitas Gadjah Mada

Dr. Leonel Hernández C, ITSA University, Colombia

Dr. Maria Susan Anggreainy, Binus Univesity

Dr. Muhammad Said Hasibuan, Institute Informatics and Business Darmajaya

Dr. Nadia Akma binti Ahmad Zaki, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Dr. Nor Aida Mahiddin, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia

Dr. Normala Rahim, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia

Dr. Nurbojatmiko, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah

Dr. Ni Made Satvika Iswari, S.T., M.T, Universitas Multimedia Nusantara

Dr. Puji Rahayu, M. Kom, Mercu Buana University

Dr. Rahmad Kurniawan, ST., MIT., Universitas Riau

Dr. Shidiq Al Hakim, M.Eng, Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional (BRIN)

Dr. Shahzad Ashraf, Hohai University Changzhou Jiangsu, China

Dr. Sandy Kosasi, M.M., M.Kom, STMIK Pontianak

Dr. Siti Rohajawati, S.Kom., M.Kom, Bakrie University
Dr. Toto Haryanto, IPB University
Dr. Tita Karlita, S.Kom., M.Kom, Politeknik Elektronika Negeri Surabaya
Dr. Wan Mohd Rizhan Wan Idris, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia
Dr. Wiwin Suwarningsih, M.T., Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional (BRIN)
Dr. Yohana Dewi Lulu Widyasari, Politeknik Caltex Riau
Arini, M.T, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
A. Sumarudin, Politeknik Indramayu
Aang Kisnu Darmawan, ST. MM, Universitas Islam Madura
Chaerur Rozikin, M.Kom, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang
Dwi Ely Kurniawan, M. Kom, Politeknik Negeri Batam
Defiana Arnaldy, S.Tp., M.Si, Politeknik Negeri Jakarta
Endang Djuana, ST, M.Eng, Ph.D, Trisakti University
Fenty Eka Muzayyana Agustin, M.Kom, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
Heri Nurdiyanto, STMIK Dharma Wacana
Herlawati, S.Si., M.M., M.Kom, Bhayangkara University
Husni Teja Sukmana, Ph.D, UIN Jakarta
Ir. Nashrul Hakiem, S.Si, M.T, Ph.D, UIN Jakarta
Kadek Yota Ernanda Aryanto, S. Kom., M.T., Ph.D., Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
Mera Kartika Delimayanti, S.Si., M.T., Ph. D., Politeknik Negeri Jakarta
Metta Santiputri, Ph.D., Politeknik Negeri Batam
Mohammad Reza Faisal, Ph.D, Lambung Mangkurat University
Muhammad Fauzan Edy Purnomo, S.T., M.T., Ph.D, Brawijaya University
Oman Komarudin, M.Kom, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang
Rahmadya Trias Handayanto, S.T., M. Kom., Ph. D, Universitas Islam 45 Bekasi
Retno Aulia Vinarti, S.Kom., M. Kom., Ph. D, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember
Riyanto Sigit, S.T., M. Kom., Ph. D, Politeknik Elektronika Negeri Surabaya
Rachmad Andri Atmoko, S.ST, M.T, Universitas Brawijaya
Ryan Randy Suryono, Universitas Teknokrat
Riandini, S.T., M.Sc, Politeknik Negeri Jakarta
Hata Maulana, S.Si., M.T.I, Politeknik Negeri Jakarta

LOCAL COMMITTEE

Conference Advisor

Dr. sc. H. Zainal Nur Arifin, Dipl-Ing, HTL, M.T
Nunung Martina, S.T., M.Si

Steering Committee

Mauldy Laya, S.Kom., M.Kom.
Eriya, S.Kom., M.T.
Risna Sari, S.Kom., M.T.I.
Defiana Arnaldy, S.T., M.T.
Iwan Sonjaya, S.T., M.T.
Ayu Rosyida Zain, S.S.T., M.T.
Hata Maulana, S.Si., M.T.I.

Organizing Chair

Dr. Anita Hidayati, S. Kom., M. Kom.

Vice Organizing Chair

Mera Kartika Delimayanti, S. Si, M.T., Ph. D.

Secretary

Dr. Prihatin Oktivasari, S. Si., M. Si.

Public Relation

Ayres Pradiptyas, S. ST., MM.

Secretariat

Fitria Nugrahani, S. Pd., M. Si.

Treasury

Euis Oktavianti, S.Si., M.T.I.

Editorial Team

Asep Taufik Muharam, S. Kom., M. Kom.

Indra Hermawan, S. Kom., M. Kom.

Design and Layouting

Ade Rahma Yuly, S. Kom., M.Ds.

TABLE OF CONTENT

1	IC2IE22-01	113	Development of Mobile Asset Management Applications with Geolocation and HaversinE	1
2	IC2IE22-02	142	Energy Saving of IoT-based Light Intensity on Smart Streetlight	6
3	IC2IE22-03	183	Cattle Breeding Management using Smart System: a systematic literature review	10
4	IC2IE22-04	219	An Internet of Things (IoT)-based smart automatic medication dispenser with an integrated web application for patient diagnosis	16
5	IC2IE22-05	394	Usage of Convolutional Neural Network for Deepfake Video Detection with Face-Swapping Technique	22
6	IC2IE22-06	831	Analysis Factors Affecting Consumer Preferences in using Qris Payment In-Store.	29
7	IC2IE22-07	899	A Secure Authentication at Remote Real-Time Data Access in IWSN-based Healthcare Environment	35
8	IC2IE22-08	1190	Critical Success Factor Analysis ERP Project Implementation Using Analytical Hierarchy Process in Consumer Goods Company	41
9	IC2IE22-09	1263	Analysis Quality of Service Voice Over Internet Protocol using Generic Routing Encapsulation Internet Protocol Security Tunnel and Internet Protocol In Internet Protocol Based on Session Initiation Protocol	47
10	IC2IE22-10	1265	Comparison of Time, Size And Quality Of 3D Object Rendering Using Render Engine Eevee And Cycles In Blender	54
11	IC2IE22-11	1508	Application of Extreme Learning Machine (ELM) Classification in Detecting Phishing Sites	60
12	IC2IE22-12	1528	Designing Case-Based Reasoning (CBR) System to Support Ship Operations using Case-Method Cycle	65
13	IC2IE22-13	1562	The effectiveness of online studying at some point of the COVID-19 pandemic for students in Indonesia	74
14	IC2IE22-14	2065	Using Cohesion-Based and Sentiment-Based Attributes to Classify Spoilers in Movie Reviews	80
15	IC2IE22-15	2114	e-Monev: Tools to Monitor and Manage Projects Carried Out by Partners Using Architectural Microservice Development Methods	85
16	IC2IE22-16	2280	Identification of Lung Cancer in Smoker Person Using Ensemble Methods Based on Gene Expression Data	89

17	IC2IE22-17	2412	Nonlinear Modeling and Robust Backstepping Control of a Quadrotor Unmanned Aerial Vehicle	94
18	IC2IE22-18	2682	Development and Evaluation of an Accurate, Efficient, and Scalable Mobile Application for Early Detection of Skin Cancer using Image Processing Algorithms, Transfer Learning, and AutoKeras.....	100
19	IC2IE22-19	2909	Low-cost surveillance System Using Smartphone and Raspberry Pi 4 Based on Real Time Streaming Protocol.....	106
20	IC2IE22-20	2931	Envisioning the Future of Collaboration for Banking and FinTech Industry.....	111
21	IC2IE22-21	3034	The Effect and Impact of The Electre Method For Sensitivity Testing on A Decision Support System Based on A Case Study Of Selecting Outstanding Students.....	118
22	IC2IE22-22	3077	Design and Implementation of IoT-Based Automatic Oxygen Flow Control in Response to the Covid-19 Crisis.....	123
23	IC2IE22-23	3501	Web Based Platform Development for Interactive 3D Visual Exhibition of Painting Artwork	129
24	IC2IE22-24	3745	Robot Relay Networks For Area Exploration	135
25	IC2IE22-25	4119	Analysis The Effect of Involvement on Brand's Social Media Instagram Account of Uniqlo Indonesia (@UniqloIndonesia) on Consumer Purchase Intention.....	139
26	IC2IE22-26	4665	Applying Software Development Risk Taxonomy in Use Case Points Complexity Factor	145
27	IC2IE22-27	4937	Online Craftmans Ordering Application Development using Waterfall method	150
28	IC2IE22-28	4969	Early Warning System on Zakat Android Application With Hybrid Fuzzy Time Series Method.....	156
29	IC2IE22-29	5004	The Aquarium Monitoring System Design for Ornamental Fish Farmers Using NodeMCU with Telegram Data Notifications.....	162
30	IC2IE22-30	5126	Electricity Time Series Forecasting by Using Transformer With Case Study in Jakarta Banten	167
31	IC2IE22-31	5305	Evaluating Deep Reinforcement Learning Methods to Develop an Intelligent Traffic Controller	173
32	IC2IE22-32	5323	A Survey of Cryptographic Algorithms for Lightweight Authentication Schemes in the Internet of Things Environment	179
33	IC2IE22-33	5558	Texture Features and Statistical Features for Wood Types Classification System	186

34	IC2IE22-34	5851	Applying Features Based on Word Embedding Techniques to 1D CNN for Natural Disaster Messages Classification	192
35	IC2IE22-35	6121	Wireless Infrastructure uses DSSS (Direct Sequence Spread Spectrum) Mechanism for Smart Government Concept	198
36	IC2IE22-36	6179	Irrigation Prediction Using Machine Learning in Precision Agriculture ..	204
37	IC2IE22-37	6317	Development of Face Mask Detection Using SSDLite Mobilenetv3 Small Based on Raspberry Pi4	209
38	IC2IE22-38	6330	Analysis of Effectiveness of Iptables on Web Server from Slowloris Attack.....	215
39	IC2IE22-39	6333	Developing an Application to Recommend Major Based on Personality Test Using Waterfall Method	220
40	IC2IE22-40	6551	Control of Super Capacitor in Solar Power Plant Using Automatic Hybrid Mode.....	225
41	IC2IE22-41	6654	Application of Software Engineering in Student Time Management Using Prototype Model.....	230
42	IC2IE22-42	6665	Non-Invasive IoT Home Medical Check Up Programming to Monitor Blood Sugar, Cholesterol, Uric Acid, and Body Temperature	236
43	IC2IE22-43	6709	Evaluation of Encryption and Decryption Performance in Smart Home Design Using the LoRaWAN Protocol	241
44	IC2IE22-44	6806	Emo-Health Application Evaluation with USE Questionnaire Method ...	247
45	IC2IE22-45	6834	Toward Sustainable Consumption Initiatives Enabled by Information Technology: A Literature Review	253
46	IC2IE22-46	6861	IoT based Battery Storage Temperature Monitoring System.....	258
47	IC2IE22-47	7033	The Development of Facial Expressions Dataset for Teaching Context: Preliminary Research.....	263
48	IC2IE22-48	7047	Identification of Corynespora Rubber Disease using Pre-Trained Convolutional Neural Network	270
49	IC2IE22-49	7306	Analysis of Extended Enterprise Implementation Case Study: Software Production House	276
50	IC2IE22-50	7666	Development of Animation as a Medium For Public Health Education ...	282
51	IC2IE22-51	7747	QSAR Study on Falcipain Inhibitors as Anti-malaria using Genetic Algorithm-Support Vector Machine.....	287

52	IC2IE22-52	7955	Design An Intruder Detection TDesigning a Thief Detection Prototype using Designing a Thief Detection Prototype using Banana Pi M2+ Based Image Visual Capture Method and Email Notifications.....	293
53	IC2IE22-53	8032	Potential Classification Prediction of Solar and Wind Energy in Indonesia Using Machine Learning with Random Forest Algorithm	297
54	IC2IE22-54	8473	Progressive Web Application (PWA) Development for Outfit Management System.....	303
55	IC2IE22-55	8545	Feature Extraction of Tweet data Characteristics to Determine Community Habits.....	309
56	IC2IE22-56	8809	Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) and Hierarchical Dirichlet Process (HDP) Models on News Data	314
57	IC2IE22-57	8821	Realtime Indoor Navigation System for Visually Impaired Person Using Direct-based Navigation	320
58	IC2IE22-58	8835	Detection of Brain Tumors from MRI Images using Convolutional Neural Networks.....	325
59	IC2IE22-59	8855	Smart Door Lock Prototype Design At Internet Of Things-Based Airport	331
60	IC2IE22-60	9528	A Web-Based Zakat Recipient Determination System Using the Naïve Bayes Algorithm.....	337
61	IC2IE22-61	9554	PhishRescue: A Stacked Ensemble Model to Identify Phishing Website Using Lexical Features	342
62	IC2IE22-62	9610	A Systematic Study for Organizing Research Topics in Ontology Data Mining Domain.....	348
63	IC2IE22-63	9890	Research Partner Recommender System For Academia in Higher Education Using Non-linear Approach	355
64	IC2IE22-64	9956	Implementation of Genetic Algorithm-Support Vector Machine on Gene Expression Data in Identification of Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer in Nonsmoking Female	361

Applying Software Development Risk Taxonomy in Use Case Points Complexity Factor

Hafid Kholidi Hadi, Renny Sari Dewi, Fresha Kharisma, Achmad Kautsar, Anita Safitri

Department of Digital Business

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Surabaya, Indonesia

{hafidhadi, rennydewi, freshakharisma, achmadkautsar, anitasafitri}@unesa.ac.id

Abstract—The studies of software development risk continues to grow. One is the software development risk taxonomy released by Software Engineering Institute (SEI). Unfortunately, no risk management research has been explicitly combined with software size estimation. Therefore, this study aims to apply risk management over 13 technical and eight environmental factors in the Use Case Points (UCP) method. The dataset consists of 345 risk factors by any sources, then mapped and justified by three experts. This mapping generates the risk frequency, which is finally modified by adding it to the origin weight by UCP. The results of the application of risk to environmental factors dominate as much as 76.81 percent compared to technical factors. There are 2 objects that the most influencing risks, such skill and motivation for both the developer team and end-user. For further research, this study still challenges how risk management can be integrated to obtain better accuracy toward software effort estimation.

Keywords—software risk, risk management, software estimation, software effort, use case points

I. INTRODUCTION

Research on risk management in software development projects was started by Barry W. Boehm in 1991 [1]. In risk management, the risk is assessed and monitored so that the project's scope, time, and cost are under control. According to Boehm, assessing risk requires 3 stages: identification, analysis, and prioritization. Meanwhile, 3 phases are needed for risk control: planning, resolution, and monitoring. This study resulted in a top-10 risk which was then continued by Carr et al. [2] as a researcher at Software Engineering Institute. At that time, SEI launched a software development risk taxonomy which was expected to be a guide in determining risk categories.

According to a survey by the Project Management Institute (PMI), the potential failure of a software development project if the risk is not anticipated and controlled properly is 27% [3]. Given the importance of risk management in software development projects, the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) guidance makes the risk management knowledge area an issue that deserves attention after project managers' scope, time, and cost management [4].

Potential risks always overshadow software development project activities. Therefore, a project manager must predict potential risks (known as a risk register) in his project planning document to control risk. The risk register is then used as the basis for project cost considerations. The calculation of the cost in the project planning document has been anticipated by several researchers, which is called software size and effort estimation. The magnitude of the

potential risk should be directly proportional to the efforts of the software development team. However, this allegation has never been answered because no software measurement method has been integrated or combined with risk other than the Constructive Cost Model (COCOMO) method belonging to Boehm, the inventor of risk management [5], [6].

Some software measurement methods are commonly used by researchers and business people in software development, one of which is the Use Case Point (UCP) method discovered by Gustav Karner [7]. The UCP method comes from the story of the business process owner. However, project managers should be responsive to potential risks, even if only based on use case scenarios. From that narrative, it is then used to calculate the size of the software development team's effort.

After reviewing many related research articles, combining risk factors with the software size calculation method to determine the amount of software development effort is the importance of this risk mapping. Therefore, this study aims to remap the risk factors used as a reference by researchers in categorizing risks, especially SEI's risk taxonomy. From mapping the risk to the complexity factor in the UCP method, the weight of the percentage of technical and environmental complexity factors can be adjusted.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Use Case Point (UCP) Method

Function Points Analysis (FPA) is the method that inspired the birth of UCP [8]. The UCP method focuses on calculating actor weights and the complexity of the use case itself. Meanwhile, the formulation of technical and environmental complexity factors was developed from the main theory, namely the FPA method. The fact about UCP is the only method that is not recognized by international standards [9]. UCP is considered not qualified and illogical in its mathematical operations.

Several UCP studies have proposed multiple-sided adjustments. Adjustments to actor weight [10], use case transaction weight [11], [12] to technical and environmental factors [13]. However, there is no single study linking risk with the UCP method. Technical and environmental factors in the UCP method can be seen in Tables I and II.

TABLE I. TECHNICAL FACTORS [7]

ID	Factors to Contribute to Technical Complexity	Weight
TF1	Distributed System	2.0
TF2	Portability	2.0
TF3	Throughput respond apps to user	1.0

ID	Factors to Contribute to Technical Complexity	Weight
TF4	End-user efficiency	1.0
TF5	Internal processing complexity	1.0
TF6	Code reusability	1.0
TF7	Able to modify	1.0
TF8	Concurrency	1.0
TF9	Security feature	1.0
TF10	Access availability to the third party	1.0
TF11	User training	1.0
TF12	Installation ease	0.5
TF13	Operational ease	0.5

TABLE II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS [7]

ID	Factors to Contribute Efficiency	Weight
EF1	Requirement stability	2.0
EF2	Familiar with method	1.5
EF3	Object-oriented programming experience	1.0
EF4	Team motivation	1.0
EF5	Software development experience	0.5
EF6	Analytical skill	0.5
EF7	Part-timer dependency	-1.0
EF8	Difficulty of programming	-1.0

The weight for each technical and environmental factor (see Tables I and II) refers to the original method of UCP [7]. Karner pays great attention to the weights of EF7 and EF8 by giving a minus value. If the given scale (0 to 5) is getting bigger, the risk faced by the development team is getting higher too.

B. Software Development Risk Taxonomy

The Software Engineering Institute (SEI) released the software development risk taxonomy (SDRT) in 1993 so that it could be used as a reference for risk identification [2]. Broadly speaking, SEI groups risks into 3 classes and 13 elements. Details of risk classes and elements based on the SEI taxonomy can be seen in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Software development risk taxonomy by SEI

Fig. 1 shows SEI's software development risk taxonomy. However, several studies propose risk grouping based on academic and practical needs as risk develops. Some of them are as follows:

- According to [14], risks can be grouped into 5 phases in the software development lifecycle, namely planning, analysis, design, implementation and maintenance.
- Survey research conducted [15] stated that risk is divided into 6 dimensions, namely organizational environment, user orientation, requirements, team, and planning and control.
- Research [16] has a different opinion from others, namely that risk is categorized based on its class objects such as requirements, cost, scheduling, quality, and business.
- In line with research [14], a survey conducted by [17] also proposed risk categories based on SDLC, namely analysis and planning, design, coding, testing, and maintenance

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative and qualitative approach. The main purpose of this study is to readjust technical and environmental factors' weight after combining risk taxonomy. If the risk has been appropriately mapped, then the new weight of each technical and environmental factor is obtained. Based on our research roadmap, future research needs to calculate software effort prediction based on the risk factor.

A. Data Collection

This study uses datasets taken from published research articles [14], [15], [16], [17] and PhD thesis [18]. Details of each identified risk item from various sources can be seen in Fig. 2 and Table III.

Based on Fig. 2, risk data obtained from various references must go through a preprocessing stage, namely removing duplicate data or similar terms [19]. We have also ensured that PhD thesis dataset [18] did not refer to the other datasets. After removing duplicates and similarity terms contained in Table III, the total dataset processed was 345 risk factors.

TABLE III. RISK DATASET

Dataset	Publication Type	Risk Factor
[14]	Journal	50 records
[15]	Journal	27 records
[16]	Journal	90 records
[17]	Journal	64 records
[18]	PhD thesis	148 records




Fig. 2. Final risk dataset

Based on Table III, the dataset we have obtained represents software risk management with several approaches. The explanations are below:

- Study [14] describes the top-50 risk factors, which are classified based on the software development life cycle, which has an output of a software risk dataset. In line with this study, research by [17] also claimed that there are 64 risk factors that are categorized into 5 software development stages, such as planning and analysis, design, coding, testing, and application maintenance.
- Wallace et al. divide software risk items by 6 risk dimensions, namely organizational environment, user orientation, project complexity, requirements, planning and control, and team [15]. All risk dimensions defined 27 risk factors.
- A dataset by [16] had 90 risk factors categorized into 5 risk classes: requirements, cost, quality, scheduling, and business orientation.
- Risk factors summarized by [18] which is stated in PhD thesis as a whole dataset. A number of 148 software risk items were identified and analyzed by IT experts.

B. Research Step-by-Step

By using expert judgment, a total of 345 risk factors were mapped into 13 technical factors and 8 environmental factors. Mapping risk is not easy using machine learning techniques (especially the classification approach).

The expert qualification in question is experienced as a project manager of at least 7 years and well-educated on risk management and budgeting. There are 3 experts involved in this research. There are five steps to conduct this research as follows:

Step 1: Determine keywords (tokenization) that have a very close meaning (synonyms) to technical or environmental factors in the UCP method.

Step 2: Count the number of frequency tokens that appear from the standardized dataset.

Step 3: Justify and map based on risk keywords against each technical and environmental factor.

Step 4: If there is a risk that is ambiguous or has the potential that claims two or more categories of similar factors, then experts need to be justified by an approach that is more technically or environmentally.

Step 5: After the risk mapping is completed, the adjustment weight calculation is obtained by averaging the origin weight and risk frequency.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The research results obtained are described in detail as follows.

A. Mapping of Software Development Risk

A total of 345 risk factors were done and mapped by MS Excel. In Chapter 3, the results of the execution of Step 1 to Step 4 can be seen in Table IV.

TABLE IV. RISK MAPPING TOWARDS TECHNICAL FACTORS

Technical Factor	Risk Selection
Distributed System	5
Portability	7
Throughput respond apps to user	2
End-user efficiency	6
Internal processing complexity	13
Code reusability	6
Able to modify	11
Concurrency	2
Security feature	3
Access availability to the third party	5
User training	14
Installation ease	2
Operational ease	4
Total Risk Factor	80

Table IV shows that only 80 of 345 risk items were mapped into 13 technical factors. This result is quite surprising that the risk to technical factors in the UCP method represents only 23.19 percent.

The mapping of risks to environmental factors is shown in Table V. There are 265 of 345 risk items that outperform non-technical factors.

TABLE V. RISK MAPPING TOWARDS ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

Environmental Factor	Risk Selection
Requirement stability	27
Familiar with method	6
Object-oriented programming experience	9

Environmental Factor	Risk Selection
Team motivation	51
Software development experience	90
Analytical skill	69
Part-timer dependency	4
Difficulty of programming	9
Total Risk Factor	265

According to Table IV and V, there is an interesting fact that 76.81 percent of the risk becomes a burden that aggravating environmental factors. The top 3 environmental factors that represent the overall risk are software development experience, analytical skills, and team motivation.

Therefore, the experts conclude that the highest risk arises from 2 objects: the developer team and the end-user. The mapping results are an initial contribution to research on the integration between risk and software size prediction, especially the UCP method.

B. Applying Risk Factors in Technical or Environmental Weight

To apply risk factors to the UCP method, the authors follow Step 5 in Chapter 3. The Risk Weight column in Table VI represents the decimal of the frequency of occurrence of the risk divided by 80 (as total risk on the technical factor). While the Adjusted Technical Weight (ATW) is obtained from the original weight of the UCP method plus the risk weight according to the i -th technical factor. The main reason for adding risk weight ($Risk$) is that the amount of risk should be directly proportional to the increase in the software development effort. We propose (1) to get the ATW score.

$$ATW_i = Weight_i + Risk_i \quad (1)$$

TABLE VI. ADJUSTED WEIGHT OF TECHNICAL FACTORS

ID	Weight	Risk Weight	Adjusted Technical Weight
TF1	2.0	0.06	2.06
TF2	2.0	0.09	2.09
TF3	1.0	0.03	1.03
TF4	1.0	0.08	1.08
TF5	1.0	0.16	1.16
TF6	1.0	0.08	1.08
TF7	1.0	0.14	1.14
TF8	1.0	0.03	1.03
TF9	1.0	0.04	1.04
TF10	1.0	0.06	1.06
TF11	1.0	0.18	1.18
TF12	0.5	0.03	0.53
TF13	0.5	0.05	0.55

Likewise, to calculate the weight of the adjustment of environmental factors that have taken into account the risk. Adjusted Environmental Weight (AEW) is obtained from the addition of its origin weight by Karner and risk weight. The Risk Weight column in Table VII represents the decimal of the frequency of occurrence of the risk divided by 265 (as total risk on the environmental factor). After operating (2), the AEW is obtained.

$$AEW_i = Weight_i + Risk_i \quad (2)$$

TABLE VII. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

ID	Weight	Risk Weight	Adjusted Environmental Weight
EF1	2.0	0.10	2.10
EF2	1.5	0.02	1.52
EF3	1.0	0.03	1.03
EF4	1.0	0.19	1.19
EF5	0.5	0.34	0.84
EF6	0.5	0.26	0.76
EF7	-1.0	0.02	-0.98
EF8	-1.0	0.03	-0.97

The implication of this research can use to readjust technical and environmental complexity factors in UCP method to estimate software development effort.

V. CONCLUSION

From the description above, we can conclude several points as follows:

- A dataset consisting of 345 risk factors is obtained from 5 sources.
- From the results of risk mapping on technical and environmental factors in the UCP method, about 23.19 percent represents the technical one (80 risks). Then, the environmental factor is dominant to 76.81 percent (265 risks).
- After being mapped into environmental factors, the most significant risks are software development experience, analytical skills, and team motivation.

This research is a continuation of recommendations from previous studies, namely risk grouping into software development activities [19]. Furthermore, the results of this study become the basis for integrating risk into the UCP method in order to obtain a more comprehensive software effort prediction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to deliver our gratitude to Universitas Negeri Surabaya for facilitating and granting this research as stated in contract number 663/UN38/HK/PP/2022.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. W. Boehm, "Software risk management: Principles and Practices," *IEEE Softw.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 32–41, 1991.
- [2] M. J. Carr, S. L. Konda, I. Monarch, F. C. Ulrich, and C. F. Walker, "Taxonomy-Based Risk Identification Taxonomy-Based

- Risk Identification,” Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1993.
- [3] PMI, “Pulse of the Profession: Success in Disruptive Times,” 2018.
- [4] K. Käsälä, “Integrating risk assessment with cost estimation,” *IEEE Softw.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 61–68, 1997.
- [5] B. Boehm *et al.*, “COCOMO II Model Definition Manual,” *Univ. South. Calif.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 6–6, 2000.
- [6] B. W. Boehm, “Software Engineering Economics,” *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, vol. SE-10, no. 1, pp. 4–21, 1984.
- [7] G. Kerner, “Resource Estimation for Objectory Projects,” 1993.
- [8] A. J. Albrecht, “Measuring application development productivity,” in *IBO Conference on Application Development*, 1979, pp. 83–92.
- [9] A. Abran, *Software Metrics and Software Metrology*. Canada, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010.
- [10] M. Ochodek, J. Nawrocki, and K. Kwarcia, “Simplifying effort estimation based on Use Case Points,” *Inf. Softw. Technol.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 200–213, 2011.
- [11] R. S. Dewi and R. Sarno, “Software effort estimation using early COSMIC to substitute use case weight,” in *Proceedings - 2020 International Seminar on Application for Technology of Information and Communication: IT Challenges for Sustainability, Scalability, and Security in the Age of Digital Disruption, iSemantic 2020*, 2020.
- [12] A. B. Nassif, L. F. Capretz, and D. Ho, “Enhancing Use Case Points Estimation Method Using Soft Computing Techniques,” *J. Glob. Res. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 12–21, 2010.
- [13] M. M. Kirmani, “Re-UCP Effort Estimation for Web Application Development,” *Orient. J. Comput. Sci. Technol.*, 2018.
- [14] A. Elzamy, B. Hussin, and N. M. Salleh, “Top Fifty Software Risk Factors and the Best Thirty Risk Management Techniques in Software Development Lifecycle for Successful Software Projects,” *Int. J. Hybrid Inf. Technol.*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 11–32, 2016.
- [15] L. Wallace, M. Keil, and A. Rai, “How software project risk affects project performance: An investigation of the dimensions of risk and an exploratory model. *Decision Sci.* 35(2) 289–321,” *Decis. Sci.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 289–321, 2004.
- [16] H. Hoodat and H. Rashidi, “Classification and analysis of risks in software engineering,” *World Acad. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, vol. 56, pp. 446–452, 2009.
- [17] B. Roy, R. Dasgupta, and N. Chaki, “A study on software risk management strategies and mapping with SDLC,” *Adv. Intell. Syst. Comput.*, vol. 396, pp. 121–138, 2016.
- [18] J. V. Menezes Júnior, “Measuring risks in software development projects,” 2019.
- [19] R. S. Dewi, “Reclassify and Readjust Software Risk Taxonomy in Software Development Activities Context,” in *2022 5th International Conference on Information and Communications Technology (5th ICOIACT 2022)*, 2022.