NDIA Workshop & Summit on CMMI®Use in DoD Programs:

How to strengthen CMMI Reporting 8 September 2005

Break-out Session Co-Chairs:

Susan Mancinelli, Lockheed Martin Brenda Zettervall, RDA Chief Engineer Staff John Kennedy, US Navy / MITRE

CMMI Reporting Break-Out Session Participants

- Roger Bate, Carnegie Mellon, SEI
- Leia Bowers, The Aerospace Corporation
- Neil Crowder, Lockheed Martin
- Lt. Col. Carlos Galvan, CSM
- Cornelius Hollestelle, Rockwell Collins
- Paul Jean, MITRE
- John Kennedy, US Navy / MITRE (Government Co-Chair)
- Susan Mancinelli, Lockheed Martin (Industry Co-Chair)
- Mary Lynn Penn, Lockheed Martin
- William Peterson, Carnegie Mellon, SEI
- Charles Ryan, Carnegie Mellon, SEI
- Albert Soule, Integrated System Diagnostics
- Dr. John Weaver, Lockheed Martin
- Donald White, Lockheed Martin
- Ruth Wuenschel, Concurrent Technologies
- Brenda Zettervall, RDA Chief Engineer Staff (Government Co-Chair)

Goals

- Determine how to strengthen CMMI reporting on...
 - Previous capability: CMMI Appraisal (SCAMPI) results
 - Capability status / change since the SCAMPI:
 - Current indicators
 - Future predictors
- Questions explored by the team:
 - How can we characterize the implementation of our process improvement efforts?
 - What additional data does the acquisition team need / want?
 - What additional data do contractors already have available?
- What vehicle(s) could be used to report these results?
 - Improved Appraisal Disclosure Statement (ADS)
 - Other sources of data / reports / plans already available
 - Revisions to / combinations of the above
 - Invent something new

Characterizing the implementation of our process improvement efforts

- Processes used by the business unit / organization:
 - The (organizational) standard process
 - The (project) tailored process
 - Proposed vs. used on the program
 - Perceived process execution costs
- Which processes are used for:
 - Teaming arrangements
 - Single, large programs (multi-company)
 - Satellite operations (smaller, remote sites)
- Defining & establishing relationship between risks
 - Acquisition phase
 - Program execution
 - Supplier
 - Appraisal

Current Appraisal Disclosure Statement contents

- Appraisal sponsor & sponsor's organizational affiliation
- Appraisal team leader, team members, their organizational affiliations
- Organizational unit being appraised (unit to which ratings apply, domains examined, as defined in appraisal plan)
- CMMI model used (version, representation, domains)
- Appraisal method (name, version)
- Itemized process areas rated and not rated
- Maturity level / capability level ratings assigned
- Dates of on-site activities
- Date of ADS issuance
- Statement affirming all SCAMPI requirements were met
- Signature of appraisal team lead (other members and sponsor signatures are optional)

Additional data the acquisition team needs/wants

- Clearly identify appraisal participants and attributes
 - Identify any potential conflict of interest
- Clearly describe the business unit
 - What work the business unit does
 - What products it produces / lines of business / domains
 - Name, Location(s) involved
 - > Needed to better understand where / how the results apply
- Appraised Organization Scope & Coverage Information
 - Percent of bottom line
 - Percent of personnel coverage (include base measures)
 - LOB / product coverage
 - Percent of programs (number of programs / total programs)
 - A subset of Scope & Coverage Review materials
 - Needed to characterize / snapshot the organization at the time
 - Capture significant org. changes since CMMI appraisal

Additional data the acquisition team needs/wants

- Program identification / profile
 - Name of projects / programs
 - Types of programs (often used for pre-defined tailoring)
 - □ Size, development, production, R&D, etc.
 - Domains / products / LOB
 - Project selection (inclusion / exclusion) rationale
 - > A subset of the appraisal plan contents
- Findings presentation (out-brief)
- Detailed process area profile
 - Characterization at the organizational unit for each process area
- Teaming arrangements
 - Provide associated process credentials
- Process Implementation Indicator Descriptions (PIID)
 - Not necessary or practical to provide

Current indicators

- What information can an organization provide to demonstrate how capable the organization is today?
 - Process improvement plans
 - Correlation to appraisal results, business goals
 - Internal appraisal plans & results
 - Quality assurance reports
 - Quality audit plans
 - ISO, AS9100 Audit Results
 - Use of Lean / Six-Sigma program
 - DCMA Participation / Evaluations
 - □ Limited during RFP; if local DCMA availability for all offerers
 - Primarily post contract award
 - □ Desired participation in CMMI appraisals
 - Government Participation / Evaluations

Future predictors

- What information can an organization provide to demonstrate how capable the organization would be in the future?
 - Process improvement plan
 - Historical data / measurements
 - ☐ Must be well defined in order to supply data
 - □ Predictive capability at higher maturity levels

Enablers to strengthening CMMI reporting

- Education
- Guidebook
- Request for Proposals (RFPs)
- **■** Contracts
- Statements of Work (SOWs)
 - Must cite use of CMMI to enable DCMA to participate
- Metrics / Measures
- Award Fee / Incentives

CMMI Reporting Recommendations

- Provide more complete, existing appraisal reporting information
 - Supply data / reports / plans already available
 - □ Augment Appraisal Disclosure Statement (ADS)
 - Updated appraisal plan (planned vs. actual)
 - Appraisal findings
 - Include / address:
 - □ Clearly identify appraisal participants and attributes
 - Clearly describe the business unit
 - Appraised Organization Scope & Coverage Information
 - □ Program identification / profile
 - Detailed process area profile
 - Teaming arrangement

CMMI Reporting Recommendations

- Educate the acquisition community on use of CMMI reporting
 - Targeted to and tailored for:
 - Procurement / contracting
 - Program management personnel
 - Source selection teams
 - Just-in-time focus on CMMI appraisal reporting information:
 - What to ask for
 - ☐ How to read what you get
 - ☐ How to use what you get
 - How to interpret results
 - What it doesn't tell you
 - What additional questions should you ask

CMMI Reporting Recommendations

- Consider joint project specific process improvement plan (Government & contractor)
 - Post award team
 - Categorize items by responsible party (mine, yours, ours)
 - Examples of large, long term contracts attaching award fee to degree of process improvement achieved

Other Discussions

Acquisition Agency requested appraisals

- What information can an organization provide to demonstrate how capable the organization is today?
 - SCAMPI: C, B, or A
 - Assumes that SCAMPI-Cs (data only) are done at the request of the acquisition agency; SCAMPI-B/A (interviews) are conducted by the acquisition agency
 - RFP sections L & M must specify the "comparability"
 - Need consistency of results
 - Customer desire to use results as a tool to assess contractor risks for source selection process
 - Correlation of appraisal results & program risks difficult at best

Goal of conducting a SCAMPI-A

- Setting expectations
- Marketing tool (rating)
- Ability to determine appraisal risk
- Prelude to process monitoring activity

SCAMPI Discussion

- CMMI embraced; SCAMPI method can be difficult/expensive
- SCAMPI-A with a rating vs. SCAMPI-B/C w/o rating
- Industry
 - SCAMPI-A, usually done for rating
 - SCAMPI-B/C for internal process evals.
- Source Selection Process
 - During RFP Usually a SCAMPI B/C; sometimes an A
- Try not to focus on the letter
- The toolset has lots of tailor-ability
 - Potential variability
- Government /DCMA participation on appraisal desired